

## **EXHIBIT B**

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

3 Adv. Case No. 08-01789-smb

4 - - - - - x

5 SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION,

6 Plaintiff.

7 v.

8 BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

9 Defendant.

10 - - - - - x

11 Adv. Case No. 10-04898-smb

12 - - - - - x

13 IRVING H. PICARD TRUSTEE FOR THE LIQUIDATION OF BERNARD L.

14 MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

15 Plaintiff.

16 v.

17 SAREN-LAWRENCE,

18 Defendant.

19 - - - - - x

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 2

1 - - - - - x

2 Adv. Case No. 10-04324-smb

3 - - - - - x

4 IRVING H. PICARD TRUSTEE FOR THE LIQUIDATION OF BERNARD L.

5 MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

6 Plaintiff.

7 v.

8 ROTH et al,

9 Defendant.

10 - - - - - x

11

12 U.S. Bankruptcy Court

13 One Bowling Green

14 New York, NY 10004

15

16 March 23, 2016

17 10:40 AM

18

19

20

21

22

23 B E F O R E :

24 HON STUART M. BERNSTEIN

25 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

1 Hearing re: 08-01789-smb Defendants' Motion to Quash  
2 Subpoena, for Protective Order, and for Dismissal  
3

4 Hearing re: 08-01789-smb Motion to take Deposition of  
5 Bernard L. Madoff  
6

7 Hearing re: 08-01789-smb Application of Temporary  
8 Restraining Order and Stay of Enforcement of Subpoenas  
9

10 Hearing re: 10-04898-smb Trustee's Motion to Compel Third  
11 Party to Comply with Subpoena  
12

13 Hearing re: 10-04324-smb Motion of Chaitman LLP to Withdraw  
14 as Counsel to Barbara Roth  
15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2  
3 CHAITMAN LLP

4 Attorney for Aaron Blecker; Helene Saren-Lawrence, et  
5 al, Defendants

6 465 Park Avenue

7 New York, NY 10022

8  
9 BY: GREGORY M. DEXTER

10 HELEN CHAITMAN (TELEPHONICALLY)

11  
12 BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

13 Attorney for Irving H. Picard, Esq., Trustee for the  
14 SIPA Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment  
15 Securities LLC

16 45 Rockefeller Plaza

17 New York, NY 10111

18  
19 BY: DAVID J. SHEEHAN

20 RICHARD J. BERNARD

21 SEANNA R. BROWN

22 KARIN S. JENSON

1 ZEICHNER ELLMAN & KRAUSE LLP

2 Attorney for Valley National Bank

3 1211 Avenue of the Americas

4 New York, NY 10036

5  
6 BY: BARRY J. GLICKMAN

7  
8 SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP

9 Attorney for Picower Parties

10 919 Third Avenue

11 New York, NY 10022

12  
13 BY: MARCY RESSLER HARRIS

14 MICHAEL KWON

15  
16 ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:

17  
18 KEVIN H. BELL

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning. Madoff.

3 MR. SHEEHAN: Your Honor, if you have a preference,  
4 we have two things this morning: the deposition of Mr.  
5 Madoff, and we also have a continuation of the order to show  
6 cause.

7 THE COURT: Yeah, I had --

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, there could be three things.

9 THE COURT: Well, actually I have three related  
10 motions regarding the enforcement of the subpoenas. I have  
11 the motion to withdraw as a lawyer for Barbara Roth, and I  
12 also have the Madoff deposition. Why don't we do the  
13 subpoenas first? Who represents the defendants?

14 MR. DEXTER: Good morning, Your Honor. Gregory  
15 Dexter here, Chaitman, LLP. I represent the defendants in  
16 this matter. I guess we'll proceed with our motion for a  
17 protective order and motions quashed. Although this motion,  
18 it really came before the Court by motion for the trustee to  
19 compel Valley National Bank to comply with --

20 THE COURT: Well, your motion really covers 11  
21 cases and his motion only covers one, and that motion  
22 overlapped with your motion in that case, so why don't you  
23 go ahead?

24 MR. DEXTER: Yes, Your Honor. As we state in our  
25 brief, these subpoenas seek records that the defendants do

1 not dispute. And the trustee has a position on that.

2 THE COURT: What do you mean the defendants don't  
3 dispute?

4 MR. DEXTER: Well, if you look at the records that  
5 the subpoenas are actually seeking, which are from 2006 to  
6 2009, all of the defendants have substantially admitted  
7 (indiscernible).

8 THE COURT: That is an incorrect statement. And  
9 I'll deal with the subpoenas individually, but I will tell  
10 you right now that with the possible exception of the  
11 Wilentz case, there are substantial disputes reflected in  
12 the responses to the request for admission.

13 MR. DEXTER: Well, Your Honor, I don't know how  
14 you'd like to proceed. Would you like to go through each  
15 one?

16 THE COURT: Tell me, you've made a motion, part of  
17 your motion is the motion to dismiss the complaints in these  
18 11 actions. Tell me why I should dismiss them.

19 MR. DEXTER: Well, the motion to dismiss is based  
20 on the trustee's wrongful conduct, in essentially  
21 representing that he would hold the subpoenas in advance,  
22 providing the defendants an opportunity to answer the  
23 request for admit, and when some of those defendants did  
24 answer those requests to admit, the trustee nonetheless  
25 proceeded, and then in other cases, where the defendants



1 didn't even have an opportunity to answer their requests for  
2 admit, the trustee proceeded nonetheless.

3 THE COURT: But your motion is predicated on the  
4 violation of a court order. You rely on Rules 37(b) and  
5 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. What's the  
6 court order that was violated?

7 MR. DEXTER: The court order is that your ruling  
8 from February 19th, in which you memorialized the trustee's  
9 representation that he had made at an earlier hearing, which  
10 was that the trustee would hold the subpoenas in advance, he  
11 would provide the defendants an opportunity to admit their  
12 request for admissions, and then we would determine whether  
13 or not we would proceed or not.

14 THE COURT: But your motion is predicated on  
15 letters sent the day before, isn't it? On February 18th, the  
16 day before the order.

17 MR. DEXTER: The motion is predicated on a lot of  
18 representations that were made, and we're all aware that  
19 this is sort of a complicated procedural history.

20 THE COURT: I'll grant you that.

21 MR. DEXTER: So it wasn't just the fact that there  
22 was a letter a day before a motion or anything like that.  
23 But when you look at all these communications in context,  
24 and you look at what they state, that these communications  
25 are that the trustee was going to hold compliance in

1 advance, provide the defendants a meaningful opportunity to  
2 answer the questions --

3 THE COURT: Well, but in the case of Saren-  
4 Lawrence, the responses to the requests for admissions had  
5 already been served, so there was nothing to hold in advance  
6 of that point, was there?

7 MR. DEXTER: Well, at that point, the trustee could  
8 have said that we think these are insufficient for the  
9 following reason, can you please clarify this? There are  
10 procedures --

11 THE COURT: I don't think the trustee has to  
12 negotiate the answers. This is the second set of responses  
13 which you've served, and as I recall, colloquy, it was, that  
14 the trustee would stand down for 30 days, if the answers  
15 were admitted, fine, but if the trustee was dissatisfied  
16 with the answers, the trustee could proceed. On their face,  
17 the answers don't admit the transfers, do they?

18 MS. CHAITMAN: Your Honor, this is Helen Chaitman.  
19 May I be heard on this issue?

20 THE COURT: No, Ms. Chaitman, you said that you  
21 would listen, and if I had a question, I would ask you. I  
22 don't entertain oral argument on the telephone on these  
23 matters. Mr. Dexter is here and can answer the question.

24 MR. DEXTER: In Saren-Lawrence, the defendant  
25 states that she does not dispute the transfers from 2001 to

1 the present.

2 THE COURT: To the extent they're consistent with  
3 the accountant's records, right?

4 MR. DEXTER: Right, because that's all she has  
5 (indiscernible) --

6 THE COURT: So first of all, though, they're the  
7 records she gave to the accountant, and secondly, that  
8 requires the trustee to prove his case by proving what the  
9 accountant's records show. What is the admission to in that  
10 case? It's still a disputed issue.

11 MR. DEXTER: Well, the trustee either has those  
12 records from the accountant, or will have those records --

13 THE COURT: Why doesn't she get those records and  
14 either admit or deny the transfers? They're her records.  
15 Didn't she give the accountant the information regarding  
16 what she'd received, and what she deposited?

17 MR. DEXTER: Right, and to the extent that those  
18 records are consistent with what the trustee has, she has so  
19 indicated. And there are only three very minor areas of  
20 dispute. And those disputes would be resolved by the  
21 information that Valley National Bank has produced, or will  
22 produce. Therefore, there is no dispute.

23 THE COURT: That's what you said.

24 MR. DEXTER: That is why I say, but the records  
25 that Valley National has produced, or will produce, will

1 resolve these very minor dispute in the Saren-Lawrence case.

2 THE COURT: What about the other cases?

3 MR. DEXTER: Okay, we can take it one by one. In  
4 the Roman case, the defendants there do not dispute the  
5 deposits and withdrawals, as evidenced by the trustee's  
6 records from --

7 THE COURT: Yeah, but they denied the receipt of  
8 the \$150,000 withdrawal on April 2nd, 2007, and the \$125,000  
9 withdrawal on March 19th, 2008. So how can you say they  
10 don't deny it?

11 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, there are so many  
12 documents at issue here. I don't have a copy of those. Could  
13 you read that in context for me? Because it may be just that  
14 they have a problem with a term of (indiscernible), which is  
15 principal.

16 THE COURT: No, I understand the denial of the  
17 characterization of certain things as principal. That's not  
18 an issue that concerns me. But let me just see. I'm looking  
19 at -- this is Robert Roman's answers. Number 16, admit that  
20 the withdrawal from the account made on or about April 2,  
21 2007 in the amount of \$150,000 was received by Robert Roman.  
22 Answer, denied, see Answer Number 15. Number 22, admit that  
23 the withdrawal from the account made on or about March 19th,  
24 2008, in the amount of \$125,000 was received by Robert  
25 Roman. Denied, see answer to Number 21. And then he also

1 says --

2 MR. DEXTER: Could you explain what the answers are  
3 of 15 and 21?

4 THE COURT: Just a minute, just a minute. Then he  
5 also says, Request Number 27, admit that \$410,000 in excess  
6 of principal was withdrawn from the account between December  
7 11, 2006 and December 11, 2008. Answer, denied. Then he said  
8 the entire account consisted of principal, but then he said,  
9 moreover, the trustee has failed to credit the responding  
10 party with \$140,000 made in deposits made into his account  
11 in the period following December 11th, 2006. So you put  
12 those into issue. You put the trustee's records into issue.  
13 You're saying that the two most significant withdrawals were  
14 never received, isn't that what it says?

15 MR. DEXTER: It's saying, please see Number 15, and  
16 please see Number 21.

17 THE COURT: So what does that say?

18 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, could you tell me? I'm not  
19 sure, because quite honestly, I don't have that.

20 THE COURT: I think that's the defendant's theory,  
21 that she doesn't receive money that she uses to pay taxes,  
22 which I'm not quite sure I understand, but I'm --  
23 particularly since I've been told they got refunds for these  
24 taxes. But look, what else?

25 MR. DEXTER: With respect to the Romans?

1 THE COURT: Next, which do you want to talk about  
2 next?

3 MR. DEXTER: Well, Your Honor, I think that the  
4 substance of their admissions is that they made everything  
5 from 2008 in 2008. They're not going to admit loaded request  
6 for admissions the trustee puts in. That would require the  
7 Romans to accept certain terms of (indiscernible) that the  
8 trustee knows are disputed, and the Romans can't really  
9 admit to anything more than that.

10 THE COURT: Okay, but nobody says they have to  
11 admit to something that they in good faith have to admit to.  
12 But then if they can admit to it, it's a disputed issue, and  
13 if it's the trustee's burden, the trustee will have to prove  
14 it. But they specifically deny the receipt of the \$150,000  
15 and the \$125,000.

16 MR. DEXTER: I don't think they do. I think they  
17 dispute the way that it's characterized, because they have  
18 admitted all deposits and withdrawals from 2000 to 2008.

19 THE COURT: Okay, but we're arguing -- but the  
20 trustees said, admit you receive this money, and they say  
21 no. And it's a withdrawal that's reflected on the trustee's  
22 records.

23 MR. DEXTER: Right, admit that your received it for  
24 the benefit of --

25 THE COURT: That's a different question. I didn't

1 read you that question. That's another question that raises  
2 a legal issue, whether you receive money that you use to pay  
3 taxes. This is just a straight-out request for an admission  
4 that you receive the money. Let's go on to other orders.

5 MR. DEXTER: Wilentz.

6 THE COURT: Wilentz, I had an issue with the  
7 trustee on that one. When the trustee responds, but -- by  
8 the way, with the exception of Saren-Lawrence, all of these  
9 defendants have asserted a defense that I guess to the  
10 extent they were required by law or contract to pay the  
11 money over to a third party, they didn't receive it. Kind  
12 of, I guess, a conduit type of a theory. So doesn't that put  
13 all of the transfers out into question? As well as the  
14 transfers in, I guess.

15 MR. DEXTER: Well, Your Honor, the rules of federal  
16 procedure have never been that if you raise an affirmative  
17 defense because you're required to raise it in answer,  
18 otherwise it's waived, that the complaining party can  
19 subpoena any record they want, and get evidence of anything  
20 they want.

21 THE COURT: But why they can't get evidence related  
22 to that affirmative defense? Nobody forced you to assert it?

23 MR. DEXTER: Well, the evidence that they are  
24 seeking through these subpoenas would not be in any way  
25 relevant or helpful to getting that information.

1 THE COURT: Why not? They know the universe of  
2 outflows, and then they could ask the person in every case  
3 what was the basis of the requirement to make that payment.  
4 Were you holding it as a conduit? Were you an agent that  
5 received it for somebody else? You've raised that issue.

6 MR. DEXTER: Well, if they get the financial  
7 records, that's not going to give them the contract, that's  
8 not going to --

9 THE COURT: Well, but then they can ask the person  
10 about each withdrawal.

11 MR. DEXTER: But aren't there less burdensome ways  
12 to do that?

13 THE COURT: I don't even know what that defense  
14 means? What does it mean?

15 MR. DEXTER: It's our burden to prove that  
16 affirmative defense. And if we don't produced the evidence  
17 to establish that affirmative defense, it's going to be  
18 dropped.

19 THE COURT: But if you do, what do we do? Stop the  
20 trial at that point and now tell the trustee he can take  
21 discovery?

22 MR. DEXTER: No, because throughout discovery, any  
23 evidence that we're going to have to put on trial, we're  
24 going to have to produce. So before we get to trial,  
25 everyone's going to know whether we have the information to



1 establish these affirmative defenses or not.

2 THE COURT: Look, you asserted in most cases,  
3 something like 42 affirmative defenses. If you assert the  
4 defense, it raises the issues are encompassed in the  
5 defense, and discovery is appropriate in those issues.  
6 Nobody forced you to raise those.

7 MR. DEXTER: Discovery is appropriate, and  
8 throughout the course of discovery, we're going to produce  
9 the documents that support those affirmative defenses. We  
10 don't see why the trustee has to be granted the most  
11 burdensome remedy possible for us to establish those  
12 affirmative defenses.

13 THE COURT: How is that burdensome to you? You not  
14 being asked to produce anything.

15 MR. DEXTER: It's going to reveal personal  
16 financial records of the defendants, for 99 percent of the  
17 transactions are not going to be relevant to this case at  
18 all.

19 THE COURT: That may be true. We don't know that,  
20 but the question is who in the first instance is going to  
21 make that determination?

22 MR. DEXTER: Well, we think it should be a neutral  
23 mediator.

24 THE COURT: Why a neutral mediator?

25 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, that would more

1 appropriately protect the defendants' confidentiality  
2 interests. It would be exposed to thousands of people, it  
3 wouldn't be exposed to the trustee's hundreds of attorneys.

4 THE COURT: BUT the trustee has agreed to hold it  
5 in confidence, pursuant to the litigation protection order.  
6 Yes, it'll be seen by the trustee's attorneys, but so what?  
7 If you're going to show it to a third party, what's the  
8 problem of showing it to the trustee under a promise of  
9 confidentiality?

10 MR. DEXTER: Because once we produce these records  
11 to the trustee, then they're going to use that information  
12 to frame complaints against subsequent transfers.

13 THE COURT: It's a different issue.

14 MR. DEXTER: Well, it all comes together.

15 THE COURT: Just a minute. When Ms. Chaitman said  
16 she was going to make this motion, I said that one of the  
17 questions I had was if you even had standing to object to a  
18 third-party subpoena on the basis that it was seeking  
19 subsequent transfer information. Irrelevant information,  
20 let's just call it that. And that's not addressed in the  
21 motion.

22 MR. DEXTER: Well, there is standing to object when  
23 a subpoena seeks the personal financial records.

24 THE COURT: I agree with you on that, but now  
25 you're talking about something else. You're talking about

1 subsequent transfers (indiscernible) before the Court. You  
2 don't know who they are.

3 MR. DEXTER: It's clear that the defendants have  
4 standing. At that point, can they take the argument further?  
5 It's established they have standing, because these are  
6 personal records.

7 THE COURT: What does the law say about a party's  
8 standing to object to a third-party subpoena on grounds of  
9 relevance? Isn't there Second Circuit authority on this?

10 MR. DEXTER: On grounds of relevance? I know that  
11 the law says quite clearly that if the financial records are  
12 subpoenaed, you have standing.

13 THE COURT: That's a different issue, that's a  
14 privacy issue.

15 MR. DEXTER: Right, and that gives us standing.

16 THE COURT: You're talking, we started this by  
17 talking about subsequent transfer.

18 MR. DEXTER: Right.

19 THE COURT: So what is your standing to object to  
20 the discovery of subsequent transfer information, in this  
21 context?

22 MR. DEXTER: As Ms. Chaitman has already state don  
23 the record, and as I thought this Court was satisfied, we  
24 represent some of those subsequent transferees. And to  
25 protect --

1 THE COURT: We don't even know who they are.

2 MR. DEXTER: Well, I don't know how we could reveal  
3 that information.

4 THE COURT: Then how do I know you represent them?

5 MR. DEXTER: Because we make the motion to dismiss,  
6 which Your Honor granted.

7 THE COURT: There was only one case, I think, of  
8 all of them, in which there was a subsequent transferee  
9 issue, wasn't it? Which was one that?

10 MS. JENSON: Halpern, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Can I ask you something else?

12 MR. DEXTER: Certainly.

13 THE COURT: If the trustee couldn't get the  
14 subsequent transferee as a matter of discovery, couldn't he  
15 get it in a Rule 2004 examination?

16 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, the trustee already had  
17 that opportunity. The trustee could have waited in filing  
18 these adversary proceedings. He could have obtained that  
19 information in a 2004 proceeding.

20 THE COURT: So why can't he do it now?

21 MR. DEXTER: As I understand, Rule 2004 is his  
22 opportunity to do that has passed, with the filing of the  
23 adversary suit.

24 THE COURT: Under the pending proceeding rule,  
25 that's only if can get the information as a matter of

1 discovery, to proceed the defendant's procedural rights. If  
2 you're telling me that he can't get the discovery in the  
3 proceeding, then the pending proceeding rule doesn't bar us  
4 getting the discovery through 2004, does it?

5 MR. DEXTER: I would have to defer to Ms. Chaitman  
6 on that one, if you would allow her, because being new to  
7 this case, that's just not something that I know, quite  
8 frankly.

9 THE COURT: Well, it's just a principle of law.  
10 It's not nothing specific to do with this case. All right.  
11 Anything else?

12 MR. DEXTER: Would you like to continue to proceed  
13 with each individual represented?

14 THE COURT: Well, all right. Wilentz, we were  
15 talking about Wilentz, and in Wilentz, I think Wilentz did  
16 admit the two transfers. I'll deal with the trustee on that  
17 one -- wait a minute. Let me see if I can find Wilentz. Oh,  
18 all right. Wilentz admits to the transfers, and there were  
19 no deposits, I think, during the relevant period. So we'll  
20 deal with the trustee on that one on why he needs more  
21 information. It may be because of the affirmative defenses,  
22 I don't know. Can I ask you a question about the Shapiro  
23 cases?

24 MR. DEXTER: Certainly.

25 THE COURT: And maybe the trustee has the answer.

1 As I understand it, Mr. Shapiro is deceased?

2 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Are the initial transferees Mr. Shapiro  
4 individually, or some sort of entity in which he has an  
5 interest. I'm just wondering what the status of those  
6 proceedings are.

7 MR. SHEEHAN: I'm not as close to that as perhaps,  
8 some of my colleagues are here, but as I understand it,  
9 there are now new representatives being brought in to each -  
10 - and they're all family members, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: So what's the -- I know that you never  
12 served request for admissions --

13 MR. SHEEHAN: No, we didn't.

14 THE COURT: Bin those cases. But you're seeking to  
15 enforce the subpoenas in those cases.

16 MR. SHEEHAN: That's right.

17 MR. DEXTER: My understanding is that that's  
18 actually reversed.

19 THE COURT: Well, I looked at your chart.

20 MR. SHEEHAN: I just got told that I was wrong.

21 THE COURT: According to the chart that I got from  
22 Ms. Chaitman in connection with the TRO, no discovery was  
23 served in the four Shapiro cases, and I did see a letter, a  
24 February 18th letter which sought to enforce, compel  
25 compliance with subpoena in those cases. What's the status

1 of those cases, what's the status of discovery?

2 MR. SHEEHAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I was  
3 listening to my colleague. I was right in my answer, by the  
4 way. We have served subpoenas in Shapiro.

5 THE COURT: And you're insisting on compliance with  
6 the subpoenas even though you haven't served requests for  
7 admissions?

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, our position is, and the reason  
9 I'm here today is for this reason. We're no longer serving  
10 requests for admissions in Helen Chaitman cases, because  
11 it's a waste of time. I don't have to serve request for  
12 admissions. If Your Honor recalls, the reason we serve  
13 requests for admissions goes back months. Your Honor  
14 announced from this bench that these are strict viability  
15 cases. Let's resolve these issues. We agree. We have served  
16 requests for admission on literally hundreds of defendants,  
17 and in many instances have achieved stipulations such as the  
18 Cohen matter before Your Honor.

19 We've worked out with hundreds of counsel all of  
20 these. This particular instance has turned into a series of  
21 motions that Your Honor has been entertaining over the  
22 period of three months. We're not advancing the cause of the  
23 case or otherwise. We will no longer service. We withdraw  
24 all requests for admissions to Mrs. Chaitman's clients,  
25 effective today, and she will never receive another request

1 for admission with regard to any other clients. We will rely  
2 upon the trustee's books and records.

3 And with regard to the subsequence, we will  
4 indeed, as Your Honor has just queried counsel on, we intend  
5 to use 2004 to get all the information you need. Every day  
6 that goes by, records are disappearing. That's what counsel  
7 is relying upon. Mrs. Chaitman even alluded to that at the  
8 last hearing that she knows those records are disappearing.  
9 So we need at this point, two things -- no more request for  
10 admissions, we get 2004 exams with regard to all of the  
11 banks so we can pursue, as we have every right to, under  
12 550, subsequent transferees here. And I disagree,  
13 respectfully, that Rule 26 shouldn't bar us. I think we  
14 should be allowed under Rule 26.

15 THE COURT: No, no that's not the question. The  
16 question is the representation was made that you wouldn't do  
17 certain things before you had served requests for admission.  
18 So what you're telling me now, is on a going forward basis,  
19 you're withdrawing that (indiscernible).

20 MR. SHEEHAN: I am withdrawing that, because it got  
21 perverted, from my perspective, to the point where that  
22 became the issue, who did what when, as opposed to what  
23 answers we got. And the answers we got, respectfully, as  
24 Your Honor has found on (indiscernible) through the counsel  
25 this morning were meaningless. So they're not helpful to us.



1 We will go ahead and quite frankly, my intention is to move,  
2 in all those cases, for summary judgment. I don't think she  
3 has a valid defense to any of this. So we're going to  
4 expedite these cases, at this point.

5 THE COURT: All right. Okay, all right. Ms.  
6 Chaitman, I'll hear from you, since your name has come up in  
7 that last discussion, if you want to say anything.

8 MS. CHAITMAN: Well, I would, Your Honor. Thank you  
9 very much. First of all, it wasn't simply a representation  
10 made in chambers, it was an agreement that was made in  
11 chambers that was a tri-party agreement. You acknowledged  
12 it, and I acknowledged it, and therefore it wasn't something  
13 that the trustee in his whim, or in his convenience could  
14 withdraw. And then I think the conference was on January  
15 28th, and then on February 16th, I may have the date wrong,  
16 but I think it was that date, in Court, and Your Honor on  
17 the record said which procedures should be followed, which  
18 was that the subpoena should be held in advance, until the  
19 defendants were given an opportunity to admit or deny the  
20 transcripts.

21 And that was an order that the Court entered,  
22 orally, in Court, and the trustee then decided that it  
23 wasn't applicable to the trustee. And now we hear that the  
24 trustee is changing the Court's order, and I just don't  
25 believe that the trustee has that power, Your Honor. I mean,

1 certainly I don't think the Court would accept my coming in  
2 and saying, "Well, Judge, you ordered something, but I've  
3 changed my mind about it, and I'm not going to comply with  
4 the order."

5 So that's number one, and number two, in the case  
6 of Mr. Lawrence, specifically, this is a situation where  
7 Valley National Bank has already produced all documents  
8 reflecting transfers to and from Madoff. So if that were the  
9 trustee's interest, he has it already. There is no dispute  
10 that those documents have been produced. In addition, Valley  
11 National Bank has no further records to clarify the three  
12 exceptions that Ms. Saren-Lawrence had in her response to  
13 the request to admit. So she basically conceded everything  
14 of which there's documentary evidence within Valley National  
15 Bank. And Jim Lawrence, who is my client, and who has  
16 standing, because it's a joint account, and his bank records  
17 have been subpoenaed, he certainly has standing to move to  
18 quash that subpoena to the extent that it seeks documents  
19 which have no relevance, other than to establishing whether  
20 he was a subsequent transferee.

21 THE COURT: Ms. Chaitman, can I just interrupt you  
22 about Mr. Lawrence, though?

23 MS. CHAITMAN: Sure.

24 THE COURT: Why wouldn't he be a subsequent  
25 transferee when the money is being put into the joint

1 account?

2 MS. CHAITMAN: Because if it was used by Helene to  
3 support herself, it was used for her. The subsequent  
4 transferee account, you'd have to trace how the money was  
5 used. The thing is --

6 THE COURT: No, you don't. Couldn't he have written  
7 a check on that account of the entire amount? Didn't he have  
8 dominion and control of everything in the account? They both  
9 did.

10 MS. CHAITMAN: Yes. He might not have used it. It's  
11 a question of who actually received the money, it's not a  
12 question of who had --

13 THE COURT: Aren't there cases that say a deposit  
14 like that into a joint account renders the joint owner a  
15 subsequent transferee?

16 MS. CHAITMAN: I'm not aware of any, Your Honor,  
17 and I think that the issue here, what the trustee is doing  
18 is quite extraordinary, and only exists in the context of  
19 Ponzi scheme, where you go after people who receive the  
20 money. And then it's a question of who actually enjoyed the  
21 benefit of the money. And I think that's we're going to into  
22 uncharted territory in the Second Circuit on this issue. But  
23 focusing simply on the subsequent transferee issue,  
24 certainly Mr. Lawrence has standing to object to the  
25 subpoena of all his bank records, which has no purpose other

1 than to permit the trustee to take discovery to which he's  
2 not entitled.

3 THE COURT: But aren't his bank records her bank  
4 records, because they have a joint account? In other words  
5 the trustee -- this is why I don't do this on the phone --  
6 in other words, the trustee has not subpoenaed his personal  
7 records, he subpoenaed her records, and she happens to have  
8 a joint account with him.

9 MS. CHAITMAN: Right, but the trustee has gotten  
10 everything from those records the trustee is legitimately  
11 entitled to. And if the trustee is now saying he's going to  
12 use Rule 2004 to take discovery which is not permissible  
13 under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, that raises a  
14 very, very interesting question, because I don't believe  
15 that Rule 2004 can be used to circumvent the prohibitions  
16 that have been announced from the United States Supreme  
17 Court on. If Rule 2004 was appropriate --

18 THE COURT: What prohibition is that?

19 MS. CHAITMAN: The prohibition against taking  
20 discovery to frame a complaint. The trustee had --

21 THE COURT: But that's exactly what Rule 2004 is  
22 for.

23 MS. CHAITMAN: Yes, but once he files an adversary  
24 proceeding, I do not believe he's entitled to take ex parte  
25 discovery, and that's precisely what he's doing.

1 THE COURT: Well, it's an interesting question and  
2 I don't have it before us, but I raised it, as to whether or  
3 not the trustee could get 2004 discovery, on the theory that  
4 the discovery would not violate the pending proceeding  
5 ruling. I guess we can deal with that at a future date.

6 MS. CHAITMAN: But I think that we've come to a  
7 point, Your Honor, where that issue has to be briefed and  
8 determined, because I think --

9 THE COURT: Do you want me to treat his requests  
10 also a pursuant to Rule 2004?

11 MS. CHAITMAN: Well, I'd like to have the  
12 opportunity to brief it, Your Honor, because it hasn't been  
13 raised before today, and we haven't briefed that issue.

14 THE COURT: Fair enough. Anything else?

15 MR. DEXTER: Would you like me to continue each  
16 defendant here, Your Honor?

17 THE COURT: Sure. We talked about Wilentz, we've  
18 talked about Saren-Lawrence, we've talked about Shapiro --  
19 now let me go to Roth. What's the status of Roth? Have you  
20 granted an extension of some sort?

21 MR. DEXTER: Can we just circle back to Shapiro for  
22 a sec?

23 THE COURT: No, no.

24 MR. DEXTER: All right.

25 THE COURT: And is it an open-needed extension, or?

1 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, because Roth is in the process,  
2 obviously, Ms. Chaitman is both representing and withdrawing  
3 at the same time.

4 THE COURT: Well, right now, she's representing  
5 her.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, and in that context, we've  
7 agreed, as we did the last time we were together, that we're  
8 not going to do anything here until we have a resolution  
9 here today. So yes, it's extended without date until such  
10 time -- but in this case --

11 THE COURT: Why don't you do the same thing with  
12 Shapiro, since Shapiro apparently is going to have new  
13 representatives, and maybe new lawyers.

14 MR. SHEEHAN: Right. But what we're doing is we're  
15 withdrawing all the requests for admissions. There's no need  
16 for extensions. We're done. This is a waste of time.

17 THE COURT: So what extension are you granting in  
18 Roth?

19 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, the Roth extension is that we  
20 would not move forward on anything until such time as there  
21 is a resolution here today. We wouldn't move to compel, we  
22 wouldn't force the subpoenas, we wouldn't do any of those  
23 things, given them an opportunity to answer the requests for  
24 admissions. In this case they're without counsel, so they  
25 can't really answer them, so obviously there's no pressure

1 on them. But the point of the matter is, Your Honor, that  
2 there are no requests for admissions after today. And if I  
3 could be heard for one minute?

4 THE COURT: Well, let me let Mr. Dexter finish --

5 MR. SHEEHAN: All right. Because there are a lot of  
6 things said by Ms. Chaitman I disagree with.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 MR. DEXTER: Just one thing on Shapiro. I think the  
9 understanding has been very confusing as to what has been  
10 served, what hasn't been served. Just so we're clear, the  
11 trustee has served subpoenas, but not requests for admission  
12 --

13 THE COURT: And he says he's not going to. He says  
14 because this will all just cause more litigation, and it  
15 hasn't produced everything, and it's a waste of time, and  
16 it's getting expensive for everybody.

17 MR. DEXTER: So is he going to hold compliance for  
18 the subpoenas in event?

19 THE COURT: No, no.

20 MR. DEXTER: He's going to proceed with the --

21 THE COURT: That's what he's saying.

22 MR. DEXTER: Well, of course we object to that,  
23 Your Honor, because it totally contravenes the entire  
24 understanding the parties had for the months of January  
25 through February, leading up to this motion practice. But

1 we'll put that objection on the record. And we think a court  
2 order should be entered preventing the trustee from  
3 proceeding with compliance with those subpoenas. He hasn't  
4 provided an opportunity to answer requests of admissions. He  
5 hasn't been able to, it's not his fault. But that proceeding  
6 with the subpoenas, compliance with subpoenas entirely  
7 contravenes the parties' understanding of the previous  
8 months.

9 THE COURT: But the trustee is arguing that this  
10 procedure that was set up that underlay the representation  
11 just hasn't worked.

12 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, we disagree.

13 THE COURT: Okay, so if I agree that it hasn't  
14 worked, do you think it's appropriate to simply let the  
15 trustee go out and enforce the subpoenas, without serving  
16 any further requests for admission? And if not, why not?

17 MR. DEXTER: Well, we don't think that the trustee  
18 should be entitled to serve theses subpoenas at all. I mean,  
19 they're seeking personal financial records that are highly  
20 irrelevant, that are highly --

21 THE COURT: That's a different issue. That's an  
22 objection to the subpoena. All I'm saying is you say that  
23 the trustee should not be able to enforce any subpoenas in  
24 the Shapiro cases, because the trustee has not yet served  
25 the request for admission, and there was a representation



1 that he would not seek to enforce the subpoenas until he did  
2 so, and there was time to respond, right?

3 MR. DEXTER: Correct.

4 THE COURT: Okay. The trustee now tells me, and I  
5 tend to agree, that this process has not worked. It hasn't  
6 accomplished its purpose, because it's been just additional  
7 litigation, letter-writing -- I have several motions before  
8 me now, and the value of the responses is such that they  
9 don't do anything. So why shouldn't the trustee, on that  
10 basis -- and putting aside the privacy issue for a minute --  
11 be permitted to seek the bank records?

12 MR. DEXTER: Because the Court's ruling on March  
13 9th that the Shapiro temporary restraining order was denied  
14 was based on the understanding that there was no outstanding  
15 discovery, and that was moot, or whatever procedural way you  
16 want to frame that, and now that's not true at all. And now  
17 he's --

18 THE COURT: There is no outstanding discovery.

19 MR. DEXTER: Right, but there's is no outstanding  
20 discovery, but there is no outstanding subpoena.

21 THE COURT: But there was no urgency at that point,  
22 because the trustee said he would stand down.

23 MR. DEXTER: Right, and we think that a court order  
24 should be entered that requires the trustee to stand down.  
25 And I don't disagree that --

1 THE COURT: Well, in other words, that among other  
2 things, says that the trustee is required to serve a request  
3 for admission in every case.

4 MR. DEXTER: Well, I think we already have a court  
5 order that says the trustee would serve a request for  
6 admission, allow the defendants a chance to respond, and  
7 would not proceed with enforcing compliance with subpoenas  
8 until that happened. And now the trustee is saying, "No,  
9 that really wasn't a court order, I could just change my  
10 mind."

11 THE COURT: Well, maybe he's just asking, to the  
12 extent it's a court order, to change it, because it just  
13 hasn't worked. There's been a frustration of the bench, in  
14 commercial language.

15 MR. DEXTER: I would agree that this hasn't worked,  
16 but not because we haven't provided substantive answers for  
17 the relevant period, 2006-2008. We're not denying any of the  
18 relevant transfers. And in the cases that we are denying the  
19 relevant transfers, we will produce those records. There's  
20 no reason why the trustee should have all of this  
21 unnecessary personal financial information.

22 THE COURT: So you agree it hasn't worked? You just  
23 said that. But it's the trustee's fault.

24 MR. DEXTER: The reason why it hasn't worked is  
25 because the route has recanted his representations, changed

1 his mind, used tactics that are intentionally designed to  
2 deceive, and now when we do provide meaningful answers, the  
3 trustee says, "No, they're not good enough, you have seven  
4 days to comply with the subpoena."

5 THE COURT: Okay, so you're saying it hasn't worked  
6 because of something the trustee did. Is that what you're  
7 saying?

8 MR. DEXTER: Of the things that I just listed, yes.

9 THE COURT: If I agree with you that it hasn't  
10 worked, but it's because of the quality of the answers that  
11 the trustee has been getting, then would you agree that the  
12 trustee should not be bothered with serving any further  
13 requests for admission?

14 MR. DEXTER: Unless you look at these answers and  
15 you say that yes, it's true, from 2006 to 2008,  
16 (indiscernible).

17 THE COURT: You're not listening to me. I just  
18 said, assume that I conclude that the answers don't advance  
19 the case, they don't admit the transfers. Would you then  
20 agree that the trustee should be released from this  
21 procedure, which he agreed to follow, and not serve any more  
22 requests for admission? I mean, I guess he's still free to  
23 serve them, but you seem to agree that it hasn't worked.

24 MR. DEXTER: Your question, that's assuming that  
25 you think the answers that we have provided are not

1 sufficient.

2 THE COURT: Right, I'm allowed to ask hypothetical  
3 questions. So if you assume that, then what's the purpose of  
4 going on with this?

5 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, in the federal rule for  
6 requests for admissions, there are remedies contained in  
7 that rule, and if the trustee is not satisfied with certain  
8 answers, he can seek remedies in that rule. That rule  
9 doesn't say he could send a subpoena on all the defendants,  
10 and get all their personal bank records.

11 THE COURT: All right. Is there anybody else you  
12 haven't covered, that you want to cover?

13 MR. DEXTER: Halpern is another one.

14 THE COURT: Let me find Halpern.

15 MR. DEXTER: That's all right.

16 THE COURT: Okay, Halpern there are several  
17 accounts, or at least two accounts. For Account Number  
18 1S0324, all the withdrawals were denied. And for Account  
19 Number 0118 -- I'm talking about the two-year period, now.  
20 I'm sorry, which were the accounts that issued them? Let me  
21 do this. I don't recall, in the 0118 account, were the  
22 withdrawals denied?

23 MS. CHAITMAN: Your Honor, may I be heard on that?

24 THE COURT: If you know the answer to it, yeah.

25 MS. CHAITMAN: I think I do. There are three

1 different trusts involved, and there are two trustees: one  
2 trustee for one trust, and another trustee for two trusts.  
3 The trustee for the respective trusts admitted the  
4 transfers. The trustee who was not a trustee for the  
5 specific trust lacked knowledge of any of the transfers, and  
6 therefore denied them. But the knowledgeable trustee for  
7 each trust admitted the transfers for, I don't remember the  
8 precise period, but it was at least 10 years, and it  
9 certainly encompassed the last two years.

10 THE COURT: I'm doing it by account, corresponding  
11 to the accounts that were questioned in the trustee's  
12 request for admission. In Account 0118, there was only  
13 \$13,266 withdrawn within the two years. There were no  
14 deposits. And I think that the trustee admitted those, did  
15 he not, or did she not?

16 MS. CHAITMAN: The relevant trustee admitted them,  
17 Your Honor. I just don't remember which trust that is. I  
18 don't remember the account number.

19 THE COURT: I think after they admitted them into  
20 the other two, the withdrawals were denied, that's my  
21 recollection. Let's see --

22 MS. CHAITMAN: But that's because there was only  
23 one trustee for that trust.

24 THE COURT: They were certainly denied for the 0324  
25 account. What about the 0086 account? Let's see. Oh, no, I

1 see that they were denied to the 0866 account. I'm looking  
2 at the responses, 15 -- the receipt for the account, the  
3 receipt of the transfers for those accounts were denied. All  
4 right. That leaves Barbanel.

5 MR. DEXTER: Barbanel has records of deposits from  
6 March 1999 on. Barbanel does not have any records of  
7 withdrawals. Barbanel is willing to allow the trustee to  
8 subpoena bank records to determine transfers to and from  
9 Madoff within a relevant time period. And Barbanel has no  
10 problem with that.

11 THE COURT: So he has no objection to the subpoena?

12 MR. DEXTER: Only if it's limited solely from  
13 transfers to and from Madoff, not in an attempt to obtain  
14 the entire universe of bank records.

15 THE COURT: I got it. All right. But he denies all  
16 of the transfers which admissions are requested, in the  
17 request for admissions?

18 MR. DEXTER: Just the withdrawals, because he  
19 doesn't have records of that, so how could he admit.

20 THE COURT: I'm not arguing with you about that,  
21 Mr. Dexter, I'm just saying he can't admit it, the trustee's  
22 got to get the information somewhere else, right?

23 MR. DEXTER: Right, the trustee should get all the  
24 relevant information, and not all entirely irrelevant  
25 information.

1 THE COURT: Okay, and who decides what's relevant  
2 and what's not relevant?

3 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, you look at the federal  
4 rules. You look at Rule 26, and the Court makes the  
5 determination. Is this really the best way to do this? Do we  
6 really want to allow the trustee to obtain all of these  
7 other records when there are numerous other discovery  
8 devices that would allow the same relevant information  
9 without the same intrusion?

10 THE COURT: Where else would the trustee get the  
11 information regarding the withdrawals in the Barbanel case?  
12 Can't ask Mr. Barbanel, because he doesn't know.

13 MR. DEXTER: Well, Mr. Barbanel could produce them,  
14 why not?

15 THE COURT: So why didn't he just admit the  
16 transfers, then?

17 MR. DEXTER: Because at the time, he didn't have  
18 the information. If it was a matter of --

19 THE COURT: So why didn't he amend his answers?

20 MR. DEXTER: It's probably a practical issue when  
21 you're dealing with, in some cases, 100 request for  
22 admission served against one defendant, there's only so much  
23 you can do. So anything that's relevant, Mr. Barbanel is  
24 happy to not contest the trustee's subpoena of, and if it  
25 would help things, he would do what he can to produce these

1 records. At this time, he doesn't have all the records that  
2 would be required for him to admit the expansive requests  
3 for admissions that the trustee has served on him.

4 THE COURT: All right. I think that covers all of  
5 the cases in which subpoenas have been served. If you're  
6 done, let me hear from the other side.

7 MR. DEXTER: Just one thing about the affirmative  
8 defenses, and let's go back to the Saren-Lawrence case. In  
9 that case, the only affirmative defense that's raised is the  
10 tax records, affirmative defense. And as has been made clear  
11 on the record, that defense on applies for taxes paid before  
12 2003. The records sought in the subpoena are records in  
13 2007, 2008, and 2009. So any records that would be produced  
14 in response to that subpoena would shed no light whatsoever  
15 on that affirmative defense.

16 THE COURT: Can I ask you a question, though? Why  
17 did she deny receipt of the money that was apparently  
18 withdrawn to pay taxes, when she got the refunds? How can  
19 she assert that as a defense, if she got a refund for those  
20 payments?

21 MR. DEXTER: Well, in that case, the affirmative  
22 defense wouldn't apply.

23 THE COURT: But I've had this conversation with  
24 Chaitman, I said, "Modify or withdraw the defense." It's  
25 still out there.



1 MR. DEXTER: Right, so I mean, that could be one  
2 remedy. The Court could say, unless Saren-Lawrence modifies  
3 that affirmative defense, then we will order compliance with  
4 the subpoena.

5 THE COURT: But I've said that already. I said it  
6 two months ago, I think.

7 MR. DEXTER: I mean, I think it's been clear on the  
8 record that that affirmative defense only exists prior to  
9 2003. But whether it says that in the answer or not --

10 THE COURT: That's what you tell me, the simplest  
11 thing to do is just amend the answer.

12 MR. DEXTER: All right.

13 THE COURT: That would be -- that could be a  
14 simple remedy to that.

15 MR. DEXTER: Yeah.

16 THE COURT: Let me hear from the trustee. Thank  
17 you.

18 MR. SHEEHAN: Your Honor, I didn't come here today  
19 to go through all this. Quite frankly, I think her motion  
20 is baseless. There's been a lot of adjectives and adverbs  
21 tossed towards the trustee. I've no interest in going  
22 through them. I think they are groundless. Ms. Chaitman  
23 has no temerity whatsoever in personally attacking anyone  
24 she feels like it and gets away with it. So let's leave  
25 that as it is.

1           On the other hand, there's been a suggestion here  
2           that we've done something wrong. If Your Honor wants to go  
3           through each and every one of these, that's just not true.  
4           And I'll just give one instance. In January 27th, we're  
5           sitting here and the so-called representation is made, that  
6           somehow becomes an order of Your Honor, that we won't. We  
7           won't enforce the subpoena until we give them an opportunity  
8           to be heard.

9           The day before, our colleagues at the -- never can  
10          think of names --

11          THE COURT: Mr. (indiscernible) office.

12          MR. SHEEHAN: -- yes -- get served a subpoena.

13          Why? That young woman was charged with contempt.  
14          Cavalierly, Ms. Chaitman comes to this court and then  
15          withdraws it. This isn't TV. You don't make an allegation  
16          and say withdrawn and that's it.

17          This is what's going on here. This is what has to  
18          stop. We don't agree with anything she has said about us.  
19          We've done that nothing wrong. While the press may be who  
20          she's playing to, we don't. We come to court. We give you  
21          our answers, and I think we've given you the answer to all  
22          her objections in our papers.

23          Let's get to the Rule 26 fiasco that she's created  
24          here. There's no basis in law for anything that she's  
25          saying. To suggest to Your Honor that we can't make any

1 discovery with regard to subsequence in the context of  
2 initial transferee cases is baseless. There's no case that  
3 holds that. She has none.

4 What she's doing is corrupting things. Let's walk  
5 through it. In (indiscernible), we have to have a plausible  
6 basis. Your Honor's very familiar with that, right? You  
7 rule against us. We say okay, how about discovery? What  
8 would Your Honor say to that? I'm not going to allow  
9 discovery. You don't even have a plausible basis for your  
10 complaint. You can't get discovery.

11 That doesn't apply here, yet that's the echo that  
12 we hear Ms. Chaitman. Ms. Chaitman seems to think that  
13 because in the omnibus case, she got one subsequent  
14 dismissed, that therefore that means we get no discovery on  
15 subsequents.

16 THE COURT: How can you get discovery? Putting  
17 aside the avoidance litigation order, which I have a  
18 question about, how do you get discovery in the adversary  
19 proceeding into an issue that's not in the case.

20 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, that's where I agree with Your  
21 Honor about 2004. But, but I think we get it before a jury  
22 and after. All right? We get it before in 2004. We get a  
23 jury for this reason. This reason is that who knows better,  
24 and what records better reflect who the subsequent  
25 transferee is than in that case?

1 And there's nothing in the law that suggests we  
2 have two weeks. Colonial Gas doesn't got that far. We  
3 don't have to avoid the initial transfer, it would seem to  
4 me, in order to wait and get discovery.

5 THE COURT: I agree with you, and I've had that  
6 case and Judge Rakoff had the issue where you don't have to  
7 -- well, first to void the initial transfer--

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Correct.

9 THE COURT: --to sue the subsequent transferee,  
10 but you haven't sued the subsequent transferee.

11 MR. SHEEHAN: And that's the reason why 'cause we  
12 don't know 'cause until we have this discovery, we don't  
13 find out. In the meantime, what Your Honor's allowing by  
14 not letting us use Rule 26 or suggesting that or adopting  
15 what Miss -- the records are disappearing. Did -- Congress  
16 intended that? I don't think so.

17 When they gave us 550, they didn't say, oh, you  
18 have to wait until you get the initial transferee, and that  
19 gives all those initials a fast opportunity to destroy  
20 records, get rid of them. You'll never find them. I don't  
21 think that's what Congress was doing, all right?

22 What Congress gave us under Rule 26 is the ability  
23 -- in this certainly germane to find out what they did.  
24 Just take the example of the husband and the wife. I was at  
25 work at Crummy, Gibbons, and O'Neal, and Andrew B. Crummy

1 told me the first place to look when you're dealing with a  
2 fraudster is the wife or the husband.

3 Rule number one.

4 THE COURT: You know what happened in the  
5 (indiscernible) case.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, yes, I do.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. SHEEHAN: But the bottom line is, is that  
9 where else are you going to look? It's a start, but there's  
10 no reason in the world why I shouldn't be able to go there.  
11 And, and this business of privacy that keeps popping up.

12 THE COURT: Let's move off the subsequent  
13 transferee issue 'cause I don't think that's standing to  
14 raise it in the context of the motion (indiscernible).

15 MR. SHEEHAN: I understand that, but I think we  
16 need clarity to be able to go forward or you -- Your Honor,  
17 you and I will be back here again and again--

18 THE COURT: Well, maybe -- okay.

19 MR. SHEEHAN: --as we were last week on trustee  
20 compensation.

21 THE COURT: You're not -- you are not gonna get it  
22 today because I don't think they have standing to even raise  
23 the issue.

24 MR. SHEEHAN: Okay.

25 THE COURT: So it's an academic discussion at this

1 point, and maybe you should just seek a Rule 2004 order,  
2 which is designed to get information to come out -- to  
3 commence adversary proceedings.

4 MR. SHEEHAN: I will do that without conceding  
5 that --

6 THE COURT: All right, far enough.

7 MR. SHEEHAN: -- we can't do it under Rule 26.

8 THE COURT: Well, it's not teed up. It's not teed  
9 up today because these are third party banks' appearance.

10 MR. SHEEHAN: Correct, I understand. So in any  
11 event, I think -- I am --

12 THE COURT: So let's move on to the privacy  
13 issues.

14 MR. DEXTER: The privacy issue, I think, is -- has  
15 been vexing the courthouse for years. It isn't new. That's  
16 one we have protective orders. We have highly confidential,  
17 where only the attorneys can look. We have confidential  
18 where our staff and others can look. This has been dealt  
19 with for years and years and years, and, you know, the  
20 heightened attention to it in this cyber world we live in  
21 today seems to give it an added value, which I think  
22 overstates the issue.

23 While we're really talking about here is that we  
24 get access to this, just as Your Honor order, by the way --  
25 you know, it seems like a century ago -- when we were in

1 here in Cohmad, and we had the same reaction. And Mr.  
2 Badway wanted to filter this stuff and mark it up and redact  
3 it and do all kinds of things. And Your Honor quite  
4 correctly ordered no. It goes to the trustee. He's  
5 operating under a protective order. He is, yeah, a  
6 fiduciary. He's whatever. He's an officer of the court.  
7 He will abide by that order, and therefore, he gets access  
8 to it.

9 The same thing should happen here. There is no  
10 privacy issue. There is a privacy issue in the sense that  
11 we need to -- not a privacy issue, I should say, that would  
12 bar discovery. There's a privacy issue that must be paid  
13 attention to, and we have. We've done it the right way, and  
14 that should not bar us from going forward and getting all  
15 these records so that we can do our job as trustee.

16 Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: All right. I'll give you the last  
18 word, Mr. Dexter.

19 MR. DEXTER: If I could, just with respect to  
20 Cohmad, that case is really not applicable to this dispute  
21 because the movant in that case who was moving to quash the  
22 subpoena was actually a defendant and actually was a  
23 subsequent transferee in that case. And in that case, the  
24 trustee had already satisfied Rule 8 pleading standards. In  
25 this case, the Rule 8 pleading standards are not

1 established, so that case does not apply.

2 THE COURT: Well, but my sense was that Mr.  
3 Sheehan was mentioning that in terms of how the privacy  
4 issue was dealt with.

5 MR. DEXTER: Right, and how the privacy issue was  
6 dealt with, and that was an objection that was raised. And  
7 I'm not sure that Your Honor on a mostly ruled on the  
8 privacy issue. I would --

9 THE COURT: Well, I essentially did by saying un-  
10 redacted records would be turned over to the trustee and  
11 they'd be held in confidence.

12 MR. DEXTER: Well, if you look at the facts of  
13 that case --

14 THE COURT: And I mean, I think I also said that  
15 the trustee should give, in that case, Mr. -- who is it  
16 Greenberg, or...

17 MS. JENSON: Mr. Greenberg.

18 THE COURT: Mr. Greenberg's attorney the records  
19 he got from the bank, and if there was a particular issue  
20 regarding what should be redacted, they should discuss it,  
21 but I would ultimately decide it rather than have a third  
22 party decided.

23 MR. DEXTER: The defendants in that case are not  
24 entitled, I would think, to the same level of privacy is in  
25 this case. In that case, those are people that were working



1 with Bernard Madoff to commit what they knew was a fraud.

2 In this case, we have --

3 THE COURT: Well, they deny that.

4 MR. DEXTER: In this case, we have people who are  
5 entirely innocent investors, were the trustee is seeking all  
6 their personal bank records. In that case, you have someone  
7 who is a known subsequent transferee, who's a known  
8 defendant in the case --

9 THE COURT: You keep -- you know, you keep  
10 confusing the subsequent transferee issue with the privacy  
11 issue. They're two different issues. And you may have --  
12 you certainly have standing to raise the privacy issue. I'm  
13 not sure you have standing to raise the subsequent  
14 transferee issue.

15 MR. DEXTER: Well, that's something we can  
16 certainly brief for the Court, but my --

17 THE COURT: I don't need to brief it. That's  
18 before me now. I need

19 MR. DEXTER: But my point -- sorry, Your Honor.  
20 Go on.

21 THE COURT: If you didn't brief it at this point,  
22 you know, what's further briefing gonna do? That's the  
23 issue raised by your motions, or the two issues raised by  
24 your motions.

25 MR. DEXTER: Well, we don't -- I don't think

1 anyone doubts that the defendants have the standings to  
2 raise these issues, at least with respect to the  
3 confidentiality. The question becomes do they have a  
4 standing to advance what is a clearly established principle  
5 of law--

6 THE COURT: Which, which principle is that?

7 MR. DEXTER: It's the one that's been repeated ad  
8 nauseam here. It's that you cannot use discovery to frame a  
9 complaint against subsequent transferees.

10 THE COURT: Got it. I think have a question for  
11 Mr. Sheehan.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: I noticed that you did not respond to  
14 the aspect of the motion to dismiss the cases.

15 MR. SHEEHAN: I think it's groundless.

16 THE COURT: (indiscernible)

17 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, I did -- I do now.

18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You can sit  
19 down. The defendants in 11 adversary proceedings  
20 representative Chaitman, LLP, hereinafter Chaitman, have  
21 moved among other things to dismiss the adversary  
22 proceedings based on alleged violations of representations  
23 made to the Court by the trustee that he would not seek to  
24 compel compliance with a certain bank of subpoenas until 30  
25 days after the trustee served request for admissions on the

1 defendants or proposed stipulations of fact. For the  
2 reasons that follow, the motions to dismiss are denied.

3 The defendants are good faith transferees of  
4 alleged fictitious profits. The trustee commenced adversary  
5 proceedings against the defendants to recover the fictitious  
6 profits up to the amounts transferred within two years of  
7 the December 11, 2008, filing date.

8 The trustee served subpoenas on the defendants'  
9 banks seeking disclosure of information relating to deposits  
10 and withdrawals during the three-year period beginning two  
11 years before the filing date and ending on December 31,  
12 2009. The current dispute arises from the trustee's efforts  
13 to enforce the bank subpoenas.

14 By chambers conference on January 27, 2016, the  
15 trustee's attorney represented that while he had and would  
16 serve subpoenas because of concerns about spoliation of  
17 evidence, which had apparently occurred in one case, he  
18 would not seek to enforce the subpoenas until 30 days after  
19 he served either a proposed stipulation of facts or request  
20 for admissions relating to the transfers at issue in the  
21 adversary proceeding. If the defendant admitted the  
22 transfers, he would forgo enforcing the subpoena except to  
23 the extent that the bank records were also relevant to an  
24 affirmative defense asserted by the defendant.

25 The trustee's concession and certain actions

1 attributed to Chaitman generated additional letter writing  
2 to the Court and more litigation. The trustee accused  
3 Chaitman of contacting at least one bank to advise it not to  
4 comply with the subpoena.

5 Chaitman in turn move to told one of the trustee's  
6 attorneys in contempt for serving a subpoena the day before  
7 the chambers conference. Chaitman also accused the trustee  
8 of misrepresenting that he had served request for admission  
9 in adversary proceedings in which he had served subpoenas.

10 As a result, the Court held a conference on the  
11 record on February 11th, 2016. The Court reiterated the  
12 prohibition against contacting the subpoenaed banks directly  
13 and instant directed the parties to first meet and confer  
14 and if necessary, raise any issues with the Court.

15 The Court further stated on the record that the  
16 trustee was free to enforce the subpoenas in the absence if  
17 a protective order "transcript of February 11, 2016, hearing  
18 at 13", and if necessary, move to compel the compliance Id.  
19 at 14.

20 Finally, the Court confirmed the trustee's  
21 commitment that he would not seek to enforce any bank  
22 subpoenas until 30 days after he delivered a proposed  
23 stipulation of facts or requests for admission, Id. at 14 to  
24 15.

25 On or about February 18th, the trustee wrote to

1 several of the banks regarding the subpoenas previously  
2 served in the Alpern, Barbanel, Roth, Shapiro, and Saren-  
3 Lawrence cases. Each letter referred to the Court's  
4 direction that the trustee could enforce the subpoena absent  
5 a protective order and demand compliance by February 25.  
6 See declaration of Helen Davis Chaitman dated February 26,  
7 2016, Exhibit 3.

8 As of February 18, 2016, and with one exception,  
9 the defendant's time to respond to previously served  
10 requests for admission had not expired, and in fact, no  
11 request for admission had been served in the four Shapiro  
12 cases. The one exception I mention was Saren-Lawrence, who  
13 had served her initial responses to trustee's request for  
14 admissions in December and had served amended responses on  
15 February 3rd.

16 Furthermore, the trustee had not served any -- as  
17 I mentioned, any requests for admission in the four  
18 adversary proceedings relating to Shapiro, who is deceased,  
19 although he served thank subpoenas in those cases and  
20 insisted on compliance.

21 On February 26th, Chaitman moved, pursuant to  
22 rules and 37(d) and 41(b) of the federal rules of civil  
23 procedure, to dismiss the cases. She argued that the  
24 trustee had violated his own representations to the Court  
25 and the Court's order of the February 11th hearing that he

1 should -- that he would not insist on compliance with the  
2 bank subpoenas before the defendants in the adversary  
3 proceedings had the opportunity to either admit the facts  
4 relating to the deposits and transfers in response to  
5 requests for admissions.

6 The defendant's motions to dismiss suffer from  
7 several fatal defects. Rule 37(d) authorizes a Court to  
8 impose sanctions against a party for its failure to comply  
9 with an order compelling discovery. Rules 41(b) authorize a  
10 court to dismiss an action for failure to comply with a  
11 court order. Dismissal under Rule 41(b) is a drastic remedy  
12 that is committed to the Court's discretion (indiscernible)  
13 federal practice section 41.5[3] and [4] (3rd edition 2014).

14 Chaitman has not identified a court order that the  
15 trustee supposedly violated. The theory is that he violated  
16 a representation, to wit that he would not enforce a  
17 subpoena until 30 days after he served a proposed  
18 stipulation of facts or request for admissions.

19 The defendants have not cited any authority  
20 supporting a dismissal for violating representation, and if  
21 the trustee have done so, the Court would follow the less  
22 drastic approach of quashing the subpoena if it was  
23 appropriate.

24 Next, the Romans and Wilentz have not produced  
25 letters demanding compliance with the subpoenas in these

1 cases -- in both cases. Hence they fail to identify any  
2 conduct that allegedly violated the direction of the Court.  
3 In addition, as I mentioned, the defendant in Saren-Lawrence  
4 served her amended responses on February 3rd, so any  
5 prohibition or agreement regarding a stay of enforcement of  
6 the subpoena had expired by February 18th.

7 In any case, the trustees insistence on compliance  
8 with the bank subpoenas did not violate the Court's order  
9 were justify a refusal of -- a dismissal of the adversary  
10 proceedings. At the February 11th hearing, the Court stated  
11 that the banks were required to comply with the subpoenas,  
12 to which they did not object on their own account absent a  
13 protective order.

14 Hence the trustee was free to demand compliance,  
15 and it was incumbent upon the defendants to move for a  
16 protective order and/or to quash the subpoenas.

17 Nevertheless, the Court's statement on February 11th  
18 appeared to be inconsistent with the trustee's  
19 representation that he would not seek to enforce the  
20 subpoenas until 30 days after he served a request for  
21 admissions or after he received unsatisfactory responses.

22 Except for the Saren-Lawrence case, the  
23 defendant's time to respond had not expired when the trustee  
24 wrote his February 18th, 2016, letters demanding compliance  
25 by the banks. The Court's statement at the February 11th

1 conference that the banks must comply with the subpoenas  
2 absent a protective order was not intended to relieve the  
3 trustee of the representation he had made to the Court.

4 Furthermore, it was not intended to relieve the  
5 parties of the requirements memorialized in the order signed  
6 on February 19th to meet and confer, seek a court conference  
7 if they would not agree, refrain from contacting the banks  
8 until any -- or refrain from contacting the banks until any  
9 disputes were resolved. In addition if a conference was  
10 requested, the Court -- the order stayed dispute of  
11 discovery pending a resolution of dispute.

12 Given the confusion, sanctions against the trustee  
13 are not appropriate. The defendants in Saren-Lawrence  
14 Barbanel, Roman and Wilentz have served their responses, and  
15 the trustee is not insisting on compliance pending the  
16 disposition of the motions to quash what -- a protective  
17 court order or a protective order.

18 Roth has not responded to the request for  
19 admissions, and Chaitman is seeking to withdraw her --  
20 withdraws her counsel. The trustee has explained it wants  
21 time to respond, although he has now was drawn the request  
22 for admissions. And as I mentioned, he hasn't even served  
23 the request for admissions in the four Shapiro cases.

24 The Court we'll address have the various the  
25 subpoenas to the extent it hasn't done, so in connection



1 with the motions to quash, but will not dismiss the cases.  
2 The defendants have moved to quash the bank subpoenas and  
3 Mr. Lawrence has moved for protective order and to quash the  
4 subpoena. The trustee has agreed to await the determination  
5 of the Court before seeking any further steps to compel  
6 compliance with the bank subpoenas, and that is sufficient.  
7 Accordingly, the motions to dismiss, pursuant to Rule 37(b)  
8 and Rule 41(d) are denied.

9 Prior to turning to the specific subpoenas, the  
10 Court will first address certain general issues that apply  
11 to all or mostly all of the motions to quash and/or further  
12 protective order.

13 First, the motions to quash are not untimely or  
14 alternatively, the defendants have good cause -- have shown  
15 good cause for not moving sooner. The parties were required  
16 to meet and confer and then seek a conference with the  
17 Court, before filing formal discovery motions. Strict  
18 adherence to the timing requirements advocated by the  
19 trustee would eviscerate the remedial purposes of the meet  
20 and confer requirements. The Court conducted several  
21 conferences and it was only at the February 11th hearing  
22 that it authorized the trustee to seek compliance with the  
23 subpoenas in the absence of a protective order.

24 One week later, by letters dated February 18th,  
25 the trustee insisted on compliance in many of the cases by

1 February 25th, only one week after the letter. His letters  
2 dictated the timing of the motions and the defendants filed  
3 a motion to quash the subpoenaed and for protective on  
4 February 26th.

5 Second, the defendants cannot quash the subpoenas  
6 on the basis that the bank disclosures might (indiscernible)  
7 subsequent transfer (indiscernible) information. They argue  
8 that the information is irrelevant, either because the  
9 complaint did not assert a subsequent transfer claim, or if  
10 they did, the claim was dismissed.

11 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(d)(3) sets  
12 forth the grounds to quash or modify a subpoena. It states,  
13 in relevant part, that the Court must quash or modify  
14 subpoena that, open quote, "requires disclosure of  
15 privileged or other protected matter," period, end quote.  
16 Open quote, "In the absence of a claim of privilege, a party  
17 usually does not have standing to object to a subpoena  
18 directed to a non-party witness," period, end quote.  
19 Langford versus Chrysler Motors Corporation, 513 F.2d 1121,  
20 1126, Second Circuit, 1975.

21 Accordingly, a party lacks standing to challenge  
22 subpoenas issued to non-parties on grounds of relevancy or  
23 undue burden. Universitas Education, LLC versus Nova Group,  
24 Inc., 2013 Westlaw 57892, 5, (SDNY January 4th, 2013)  
25 (collecting cases). The defendants, therefore, lack

1 standing to quash subpoenas because the bank records  
2 contained irrelevant -- on the theory that the bank records  
3 contained irrelevant subsequent transfer information.

4 Moreover, the defendants have put subsequent  
5 transfers into issue through their affirmative defenses.  
6 Every defendant asserted that he or she was entitled to a  
7 (indiscernible) or equitable adjustment to the extent he or  
8 she paid taxes on fictitious profits. Judging from the  
9 responses to the requests for admissions, several of the  
10 defendants paid the taxes from the same accounts in which  
11 they deposited their withdrawals from BLMIS.

12 The defendants contend that they are no longer  
13 asserting this defense for any period after 2003, because  
14 the government granted them relief, and refunded the part of  
15 the tax payments attributable to the fictitious profits.  
16 However, the defendants have not modified or withdrawn this  
17 defense, despite the Court's admonition to do so.

18 More generally, every defendant, except for Saren-  
19 Lawrence has asserted the defense that open quote, "there  
20 can be no liability of any recipient of funds, who, as a  
21 matter of law or contract was required to transfer any  
22 portion of the fund to a third party," closed quote. This  
23 defense implies that these defendants intend to argue that  
24 they lack dominion and control of some of the BLMIS  
25 withdrawals that they subsequently transferred.

1 Third, the defendants have standing to object to  
2 the third party subpoenas on privacy grounds, but bear the  
3 burden of persuasion as to the parties seeking to quash the  
4 subpoenas. Concord Boat Corporation versus Brunswick, 169  
5 FRD 44, 48, (SDNY, 1996). While Courts have recognized that  
6 an individual has a privacy interest in his personal  
7 financial information, In Re: Glitnir, G-L-I-T-N-I-R, Bank  
8 2011 Westlaw 3652764, 5 (Bankruptcy, SDNY, August 19, 2011)  
9 (collecting cases), the right to privacy is not absolute,  
10 open quote, "When a subpoena seeks the production of an  
11 individual's personal financial information, the Court must  
12 balance the relevance of the information sought against the  
13 intrusion into the affected individual's privacy interest,"  
14 period, closed quote, id.

15 Unlike the portion of the administrative subpoena  
16 quashed in McWane versus FDIC. F.3d, 1127, (Second Circuit  
17 1995), a case cited by the defendants, the trustee is  
18 seeking the defendants own relevant personal financial  
19 information. McWane upheld the subpoenas to that extent.

20 The bank information is plainly relevant because  
21 the trustee is seeking to recover transfers from BLMIS to  
22 the defendants and the defendants presumably deposited the  
23 transfers into their bank accounts. Furthermore, the  
24 information is not duplicative of the trustee's records,  
25 because the defendants have challenged the accuracy of the

1 trustee's records. If the defendants don't believe the  
2 BLMIS records are accurate, I may not either. In that case  
3 the trustee may have to prove his case, through the  
4 defendants' bank records.

5 Even if the defendant does not dispute the  
6 accuracy of the BLMIS records, the defendants' refusal to  
7 admit the transfers makes them a disputed fact the trustee  
8 must prove through other evidence. The trustee is entitled  
9 to the bank information to prove the fact that the transfers  
10 will meet the affirmative defenses.

11 The counterbalance against the relevancy of the  
12 records is the defendants' general assertion of a right to  
13 privacy in their financial records but nothing more. Given  
14 the importance of the bank records to the trustee's  
15 fraudulent transfer claims, and the defendants' denial of  
16 some or all of those transfers, they have failed to sustain  
17 their burden to show that their general privacy concerns  
18 outweigh the relevance of the bank information. Moreover,  
19 the trustee has agreed to treat the bank information as  
20 confidential thus preventing their disclosure to the world  
21 at large.

22 This conclusion also applies to the request for a  
23 protective order filed by James Lawrence, the spouse of the  
24 defendant Helene Saren-Lawrence. The trustee did not  
25 subpoena Mr. Lawrence's bank records, rather, he subpoenaed

1 his wife's bank records at Valley National Bank, and Mr.  
2 Lawrence and his wife are the joint owners of the account,  
3 by their own choice. Mr. Lawrence admits that his wife's  
4 Madoff-related transfers, including the tax refunds relating  
5 to liabilities she still seeks to offset, were deposited  
6 into the joint account, declaration of James Lawrence, in  
7 support of motion for a protective order, dated February 22,  
8 2016 at Paragraph 3.

9 The defendant has not admitted to any of the  
10 transfers from Madoff. Her responses to the request for  
11 admissions only admit to the transfers to the extent they  
12 are consistent with the records subpoenaed from her  
13 accountant. This requires the trustee to prove the  
14 transfers through the accountant's records, which  
15 contravenes the very purpose of request for admission, and  
16 is effectively a denial of the transfers.

17 Furthermore, Valley National's production of  
18 records redacted only to show what it says -- what it  
19 contends are only the Madoff-related transfers and  
20 withdrawals, see id., is no substitute for an unredacted  
21 production. Redactions breed suspicion and may deprive the  
22 reader of context, In Re: State Street Bank and Trust  
23 Company, Fixed Income Funds Investments Litigation, 2009,  
24 Westlaw 1026013, 1 (SDNY April 8, 2009). They are only  
25 permissible to protect privileged, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

1 versus Book Dog Books, LLC, 298 FRD 184, 186 (SDNY 2014),  
2 and the Court has concluded that the relevance of the  
3 records outweighs any general privacy concerns.

4 The defendant's suggestion that they or a third  
5 party redacted documents is therefore unacceptable.

6 Moreover, if the defendants are willing to show the records  
7 to show the records to a neutral third party, there is no  
8 reason why they shouldn't show them to the trustee who will  
9 hold them in confidence. If the defendants seek the  
10 redaction of specific records turned over to the trustee,  
11 the defendant can raise any redaction request based upon  
12 privacy concerns directly with the Court.

13 Now with respect to the specific subpoenas, I've  
14 already dealt with the subpoenas in Saren-Lawrence. As I've  
15 suggested, the admission to the transfers to the extent  
16 they're consistent with Ms. Saren-Lawrence's accountant's  
17 records is just not an admission at all, and as I said would  
18 require the trustee, essentially, to put the accountant on  
19 the stand, ask him about the records to prove the transfers.  
20 That doesn't accomplish the purpose that the transfers were  
21 intended to accomplish and for that reason, whatever the  
22 trustee's representations were about holding off compliance,  
23 the responses don't admit the transfers, so the trustee is  
24 free to compel compliance with the subpoenas.

25 With respect to the Romans, in both cases I note

1 that they denied transfers of \$150,000 and \$125,000, they  
2 denied receipt of those transfers, they didn't simply deny  
3 the transfers. So they put those transfers in issue.  
4 They've also stated that they did not receive credit for  
5 \$140,000 worth of deposits that they made so those deposits  
6 are also at issue because they would obviously affect the  
7 trustee's computation of fictitious profits and the amount  
8 that he could ultimately recover.

9 In addition, like all the other defendants, except  
10 for Saren-Lawrence, that have raised this affirmative  
11 defense, that somehow money they got from BLMIS, that they  
12 were required to transfer by contract or other -- or by law,  
13 was not itself a receipt of money, puts the subsequent  
14 transfers in issue.

15 With respect to Halpern, I noted that two of the  
16 three accounts, all of the transfers were denied, but I  
17 thought for one of the accounts all of the transfers were  
18 admitted.

19 MAN: We don't know.

20 THE COURT: Well you're seeking to enforce  
21 compliance with these subpoenas. It's the -- I think it's  
22 Account 324. Or I'm sorry, one of them is -- no, no, no, I  
23 take that back. I see an answer to Question Number 76 that  
24 the receipt of \$43,096 was denied. And also in response to  
25 Request Number 81, the receipt of \$63,259 was denied. Also,



1 the return of a check was denied.

2 Which of the Halpern -- were there any of the  
3 Halpern accounts where the transfers were admitted, Mr.  
4 Dexter?

5 MR. DEXTER: Yes, the Halpern's admitted --

6 THE COURT: Which one?

7 MR. DEXTER: -- -- had a request for admission 78,  
8 79, 82 --

9 THE COURT: Let me see. 78, 79? Which account is  
10 that?

11 MR. DEXTER: I'm not sure which account that is.

12 THE COURT: Let me just see. It's Account 324,  
13 but they denied several of the receipts and they denied the  
14 receipt of the -- or the returned check.

15 So -- and they've also asserted that defense that  
16 I mentioned about receiving money as a conduit or in trust  
17 on some theory that it doesn't count as a receipt. So I'll  
18 compel compliance with those subpoenas.

19 What about Barbanel? I thought I said Barbanel  
20 had denied all the receipts and I think you told me he  
21 didn't have any other records? Is that -- is he the one?

22 MR. DEXTER: On the withdrawals, correct?

23 THE COURT: Oh, he was -- okay. So I'll compel  
24 compliance with those subpoenas.

25 Now with Wilentz, and I know he has this

1 affirmative defense, like everybody else, but he's admitted  
2 the receipt of the money and there were no deposits during  
3 the two-year period. So why do you need his or its bank  
4 records? There are two accounts, I think. One received  
5 \$130,000, one received \$150,000 and he's admitted that.

6 MS. JENSON: Your Honor, these are the responses  
7 where the defendant is also challenging the accuracy of the  
8 BLMIS bank records.

9 THE COURT: But you only -- I know. And that goes  
10 back to whenever the account was opened. But you're only  
11 asking about that two or three-year period.

12 MS. JENSON: Right.

13 THE COURT: And he's admitted that.

14 MS. JENSON: And --

15 THE COURT: And there's nothing that the bank will  
16 produce, in response to the subpoenas that's relevant to the  
17 -- these other transfers, which go to computing the  
18 fictitious profits.

19 MS. JENSON: Your Honor, if I may propose a  
20 solution to this. We learned, during preparing for the  
21 argument, that in their claim submission to the trustee, the  
22 Wilentz defendants stated that they have all of their bank  
23 records going back to the relevant time period, and they  
24 match the BLMIS records. And so we would be satisfied with  
25 the production of the defendant's records.

1 THE COURT: Is that acceptable, Mr. Dexter?

2 MR. DEXTER: I'm not sure I understand that  
3 solution. Satisfied with --

4 THE COURT: In other words, they're going to  
5 withdraw the subpoena to the bank on the condition that the  
6 defendant produce all his bank records. Because they  
7 understand that he has all the bank records going back, I  
8 guess, to the beginning of the account?

9 MS. JENSON: That's what she states in her claim  
10 submission.

11 MR. DEXTER: Well we have no problems reducing  
12 whatever she has. I'm not familiar with that claim  
13 submission, so I can't --

14 THE COURT: Why don't we hold that one in  
15 abeyance. I won't compel compliance for this -- at this  
16 point. We can adjourn it for 30 days, if you want, to see  
17 if you get the bank records. And I -- but from what you're  
18 telling me is if you get all the bank records from -- is it  
19 a him or a her?

20 MS. JENSON: It's a her.

21 THE COURT: A her. If you get all the bank  
22 records from her, then you don't need to go forward with the  
23 -- to get the same bank records from the bank.

24 MS. JENSON: Obviously she has a more complete set  
25 than the bank might.

1 THE COURT: Okay. And these are going to be  
2 unredacted records that are going to be produced.

3 MS. JENSON: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: Let's just bear that one in mind and  
5 we'll hold that one aside.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Now with respect to Shapiro -- let me  
8 deal with Roth first. You told me you're withdrawing your  
9 request for admissions in Roth and you're not going to serve  
10 request for admission in Shapiro. There may be other  
11 problems that delay the Shapiro case, I don't know, from  
12 going forward. And so that in essence you're saying  
13 whatever you represented in the past that hasn't worked for  
14 the reasons we've discussed, and on a going forward basis,  
15 you're not going to waste time or money sending requests for  
16 admissions because we'll be back in court fighting over that  
17 objection.

18 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor, with one footnote.  
19 Got to have one. Is that in both instances, Roth and  
20 Shapiro, new counsel are coming on board. All right? New  
21 counsel who -- one is -- I know we've worked with before.

22 THE COURT: Well do you want to adjourn those?

23 MR. SHEEHAN: Yeah, I would like to actually  
24 adjourn those until new counsel is on board --

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. SHEEHAN: -- and then we --

2 THE COURT: And then --

3 MR. SHEEHAN: -- can perhaps resolve it with  
4 counsel and then inform Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Who's the new counsel in Roth?

6 MR. SHEEHAN: It's -- I don't know Roth, but --

7 MS. JENSON: I'm sorry --

8 MR. SHEEHAN: -- I think in Shapiro -- do we know?

9 MS. JENSON: We don't have counsel on Roth. We  
10 actually received a phone call from the defendant, Roth,  
11 yesterday. She is expecting -- she is under the impression  
12 that the motion to withdraw has already been granted.  
13 That's on your docket for today. And we will call her back  
14 after that motion to withdraw is granted.

15 THE COURT: Well if it's -- my question is, if  
16 it's granted, and I don't have a problem with granting it, I  
17 didn't want to do it before today and affect the timing of  
18 the resolution of all these issues.

19 MR. SHEEHAN: Right.

20 THE COURT: But if it's granted, what do you  
21 propose to do with respect to the subpoena in the Roth case?

22 MR. SHEEHAN: Is to talk to the new counsel and  
23 see what we could work out there.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MR. SHEEHAN: And if we could work something out,

1 then as we have, as I said earlier, with many other counsel,  
2 we may or may not need to subpoena. And the same thing may  
3 be true with Shapiro.

4 THE COURT: All right. Do you have any objection  
5 then to adjourning the issue of compliance in Wilentz, the  
6 four Shapiro cases and Roth for 30 days to see if this can  
7 be worked out?

8 MR. SHEEHAN: No problem, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Provided that the banks are on  
10 notice to maintain records, so just -- it's being adjourned  
11 and you can provide for that.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: And then I'll grant -- Ms. Chaitman,  
14 I'll grant your motion on that basis to withdraw in Roth.  
15 And you can submit an order to that effect. Okay? I guess  
16 she's gone.

17 Mr. Dexter, you can submit an order for your firm  
18 withdrawing in Roth. I'll grant that motion.

19 MR. DEXTER: Yes, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: All right. Then with respect to the  
21 Roman cases, Barbanel, Halpern and Saren-Lawrence, I'm  
22 granting -- I'm denying the motions to quash the subpoenas  
23 and the motions for a protective order and directing  
24 compliance, subject to the requirement that the documents  
25 produced by the banks be held in confidence pursuant to the

1 -- I think it's the litigation protective order of June 6th,  
2 2011. All right?

3 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: With respect to the -- well, let's say  
5 that with respect to the motions in Roth, Shapiro and  
6 Wilentz, they'll be adjourned for a period of 30 days and  
7 we'll use that as a reporting date. When is the other date  
8 in late April when you're supposed to come back?

9 THE CLERK: 25th.

10 THE COURT: the 25th?

11 MAN: 27th.

12 THE COURT: 22nd?

13 MR. SHEEHAN: 27th, Your Honor, I believe.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Fine. Why don't we adjourn  
15 those motions to that date, for conference purposes, advise  
16 the banks they're to hold on to their records, because --

17 MR. SHEEHAN: We will do that. And  
18 (indiscernible) --

19 THE COURT: -- the matters are not resolved.

20 MR. SHEEHAN: Absolutely, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? Oh, we have  
22 the Madoff deposition.

23 MS. JENSON: And I'm sorry, just so the record's  
24 clear, the motion to compel Valley National Bank to produce  
25 I --

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2 MS. JENSON: -- understand that to be granted?

3 THE COURT: Yes. And the motions to dismiss are  
4 denied.

5 MS. JENSON: Thank you.

6 MR. GLICKMAN: Your Honor, may I?

7 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

8 MR. GLICKMAN: Barry Glickman on behalf of Valley  
9 National Bank. Just one question in the context of the  
10 compliance. I understand that there is a protective order  
11 in place. Should we mark these documents as produced  
12 consistent with that confidentiality order?

13 MR. SHEEHAN: That would be fine, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. And if you --

15 MR. GLICKMAN: Sure.

16 THE COURT: -- can't work it out, then you can  
17 come back.

18 MR. GLICKMAN: And is there a time frame on that?

19 THE COURT: Well, you -- how long is it going to  
20 take you to produce the record?

21 MR. GLICKMAN: If we could ten days, I'd  
22 appreciate that.

23 MR. SHEEHAN: Done.

24 THE COURT: It's been going on for eight years --  
25 six years, really. All right.



1 MR. GLICKMAN: We can six months?

2 THE COURT: No.

3 MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you, Judge.

4 MS. JENSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right. Now --

6 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, one thing, if I may --

7 THE COURT: Sure.

8 MR. DEXTER: -- before we proceed to the next  
9 motion? As you did in Cohmad, will you grant leave to  
10 appeal this?

11 THE COURT: Well I can't grant leave to appeal,  
12 only the District Court can grant leave to appeal.

13 MR. DEXTER: Will you allow a stay so we can seek  
14 (indiscernible)?

15 THE COURT: I'll grant you a 14-day stay.

16 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: And apprise Mr. Glickman.

18 MR. GLICKMAN: Okay.

19 THE COURT: I'll grant you a 14-day stay, you can  
20 put that in the order. Not a stay on the dismissed -- on  
21 the motion to dismiss. Let Mr. Glickman know --

22 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: -- he'll send you a copy of the order.

24 MR. SHEEHAN: But tell him he's got 14 days.

25 THE COURT: Pardon?

1 MR. SHEEHAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I said --

2 THE COURT: Get me the order today, it'll be the  
3 14 days from the date of the entry of order of stay, then it  
4 is up to the District Court if it wants to entertain the  
5 matter.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Absolutely, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: How is the Cohmad matter settled? Is  
8 the Cohmad matter still pending?

9 MR. SHEEHAN: Yeah, well what happened was is that  
10 there was an attempt to appeal by Mr. Badway and we resolved  
11 and it we turned over the bank records in compliance with  
12 Your Honor's order.

13 THE COURT: Oh, all right. Okay. Could I have  
14 the Madoff deposition (indiscernible).

15 All right. The last matter I have on the calendar  
16 is the motion to conduct the deposition of Mr. Madoff with  
17 respect to the profit withdrawal issue.

18 MR. DEXTER: Yes, Your Honor. This is the  
19 customers' motion. As we've laid it out in our briefs,  
20 under the trustee shall conduct examinations by deposition  
21 or otherwise, of the debtor, for some reason that has not  
22 occurred in this case.

23 THE COURT: And maybe the trustees has made the  
24 determination he's not going to believe what he says?

25 MR. DEXTER: It seems that the trustee has made a

1 lot of determinations by himself. This Court has  
2 acknowledged that Mr. Madoff would be the most authoritative  
3 source of information.

4 THE COURT: I never said that. I never said that.  
5 I said that I thought that there must be people who worked  
6 for Madoff, and made these entries, that would know what  
7 they meant. You really think Mr. Madoff made these entries?

8 MR. DEXTER: He would certainly be a good  
9 individual to ask, as to who would have information about  
10 them.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. DEXTER: Do I think Mr. Madoff would have  
13 information about these entries? Probably. There's one way  
14 to find out, and that's to have a deposition conducted.

15 THE COURT: One of the concerns, and this may be  
16 the only concern, I don't know, is that the deposition will  
17 not be limited to the profit withdrawal issue. And  
18 specifically, we could get into the issue of Mr. Picower.  
19 And the reason why -- the reason for that is in the  
20 declaration put in in the Aaron Blecker matter there was a  
21 paragraph relating to Mr. Picower that had nothing to do  
22 with Mr. Blecker's particular dispute. So how do we prevent  
23 that, if Mr. Madoff is deposed?

24 MR. DEXTER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. So you're  
25 acknowledging that you're going to proceed with granting

1 leave to depose --

2 THE COURT: I'm asking you a question. I'm asking  
3 you another hypothetical question. If I agree that you  
4 should be entitled to take the deposition, what's to prevent  
5 you from asking or eliciting information relating, not only  
6 to Picower, but to other matters affecting cases in which  
7 the parties won't be present at the deposition?

8 MR. DEXTER: Well all you have to do is limit --  
9 is enter an order limiting testimony to that scope. And the  
10 customers have no intent, whatsoever, to seek any  
11 information related to Mr. Picower. The fact that there was  
12 information about him on the same declaration is just sort  
13 of a practical matter, when you're dealing with someone  
14 who's in jail and you can only get one declaration, that's  
15 totally overblown and quite frankly irrelevant. Because --

16 THE COURT: Well it was irrelevant when you put it  
17 into the Blecker --

18 MR. DEXTER: Well that --

19 THE COURT: -- you interjected it in the Blecker  
20 matter. Why'd you do that?

21 MR. DEXTER: It's just that there's one  
22 declaration.

23 THE COURT: But the --

24 MR. DEXTER: Mr. Madoff has signed one  
25 declaration. It happens to have things in it that aren't

1 necessarily related to this motion.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. DEXTER: You know, it's not -- there's nothing  
4 to make of that, at all.

5 THE COURT: You think not?

6 MR. DEXTER: I don't think so.

7 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from the other  
8 side.

9 MS. BROWN: Good morning, Your Honor. Seanna  
10 Brown on behalf of the trustee.

11 Your Honor, let me start with the second issue  
12 about whether or not the deposition should be limited. I  
13 just want to follow up on one thing that counsel just said,  
14 which is they have no intention of asking any questions  
15 regarding the Picower Parties.

16 And Judge Cottle has ruled that Ms. Chaitman is  
17 not entitled to that relief, she should not be using this  
18 proceeding as an end run around that order. And if they  
19 have no intention of asking any questions about that, they  
20 should consent to the relief that the trustee and the  
21 Picower Parties are seeking --

22 THE COURT: Any objection?

23 MS. BROWN: -- in the limiting order.

24 THE COURT: Any objection to the limiting language  
25 in the -- that they propose?

1 MR. DEXTER: Where is that language? I would need  
2 to review that language specifically. We have no objections  
3 to generally limiting the scope. I'd have to look at the  
4 specific language.

5 MS. BROWN: I can provide a summary of what --

6 THE COURT: Go ahead.

7 MS. BROWN: -- relief we sought. The first one is  
8 that Madoff cannot give testimony about the Picower Parties.  
9 The second point is that Ms. Chaitman cannot question him on  
10 the Picower Parties. The third point is that the transcript  
11 cannot be used in any way until appropriate redactions are  
12 made to the extent improper questions are posed, or  
13 testimony is given. And the fourth is that the transcript  
14 can only be used in the context of the profit withdrawal  
15 proceeding, and not against the Picower Parties or in any  
16 other matter in which Ms. Chaitman -- or any other matter.

17 THE COURT: Any objection to those conditions?

18 MR. DEXTER: This should really be something for  
19 Ms. Chaitman to address --

20 THE COURT: Well, no, no.

21 MR. DEXTER: -- if she's on the line.

22 THE COURT: This has been -- Ms. Chaitman are you  
23 on the line? Gone. She's in Barcelona.

24 You know, this issue was coming up today and my  
25 sense in the reply brief was that the conditions were

1 agreeable.

2 MR. DEXTER: The conditions are agreeable, that  
3 are consistent with that -- what is proposed. What I would  
4 propose is that if Your Honor is inclined to grant leave to  
5 depose Bernard Madoff, customers' consent to limits --  
6 limitations on the scope consistent with the spirit of  
7 what's been proposed. And then we could have a few days to  
8 just sort of iron that out.

9 THE COURT: Iron what out? Any order that I enter  
10 would have those limitations in it.

11 MR. DEXTER: Well in that case, there -- our  
12 objection would be futile and --

13 THE COURT: (indiscernible) --

14 MR. DEXTER: -- we'll allow you to enter that  
15 order.

16 THE COURT: But I want to resolve this before I  
17 enter the order, if I do enter the order. If it can't be  
18 resolved, I won't enter the order.

19 Look at the conclusion in the trustee's objection,  
20 which sets forth five conditions which I think are the same  
21 five conditions of the Picower Parties' requests?

22 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: I think there may be a few  
23 additional ones in the Picower Parties, so --

24 THE COURT: Well maybe we ought to turn to the  
25 Picower Parties, we'll see.

1 MR. DEXTER: This is in the Picower Parties'   
2 response?

3 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes.

4 MR. DEXTER: Yeah, now I'm looking at. Okay.

5 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: It's on Page 11 of the   
6 Picower --

7 THE COURT: Yeah.

8 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: -- Parties' response.

9 THE COURT: There seem to be seven conditions   
10 instead of five. It's a little more specific about   
11 inquiries about Picower.

12 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: That's right. They're the   
13 same ones that the trustee's counsel just --

14 THE COURT: Well --

15 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: -- identified. And then in   
16 addition, we want to make sure that we -- that the Picower   
17 counsel has the opportunity to review a transcript that's   
18 been marked confidential, to make sure that there has been   
19 compliance before any use of the deposition -- of the   
20 transcript can be made.

21 And we want to make sure that neither the Chaitman   
22 parties nor any parties ever can use the transcript in any   
23 action to be brought against the Picower Parties or their   
24 agencies.

25 And finally --



1 THE COURT: Are you proposing the transcript first  
2 be filed under seal and then parties -- particularly the  
3 Picower Parties, because it's really their issue, although I  
4 suppose --

5 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: I think it's the trustee's --

6 THE COURT: -- although I suppose questions could  
7 be asked about a lot of cases --

8 MS. BROWN: Yes.

9 THE COURT: -- and counsel for those parties would  
10 not be present. Oh, before I forget. I think that there's  
11 one other law firm involved in profit withdrawal issue.

12 MS. BROWN: There is. Your Honor, it's --

13 THE COURT: Mr. Kirby?

14 MS. BROWN: -- it's Baker and McKenzie, Richard  
15 Kirby.

16 THE COURT: So he would be entitled, since you  
17 would presume -- or somebody might use that transcript  
18 against his clients, wouldn't he be entitled to participate  
19 in this --

20 MS. BROWN: We have no objection to --

21 THE COURT: -- or at least invited?

22 MS. BROWN: -- Mr. Kirby attending the deposition,  
23 seeing as he is participating in the profit withdrawal  
24 proceeding.

25 THE COURT: All right. Subject to the same

1 limitations.

2 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: All right. The Court -- let's keep  
4 that one in mind.

5 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: And then Your Honor, we also  
6 want part of the limiting order, if there is one, to direct  
7 that any violations of the limiting order would result in  
8 sanctions, because --

9 THE COURT: That's self-evident, but it could be  
10 in the order.

11 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Okay.

12 THE COURT: Now do you propose to take this  
13 deposition by telephone? It seems to me it's going to be a  
14 short deposition.

15 MR. DEXTER: No, we'd like to take it in North  
16 Carolina at the penitentiary.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MS. BROWN: Your Honor, I still do want to be  
19 heard on why the deposition shouldn't go forward at all.

20 THE COURT: Go ahead. Go ahead.

21 MS. BROWN: We don't feel that the deposition  
22 should be permitted because Madoff's declaration revealed  
23 that he doesn't have personal knowledge about the profit  
24 withdrawal transactions.

25 THE COURT: So then it will be even a short

1 deposition.

2 MS. BROWN: True. But we don't think that he's  
3 shown that he has a -- personal knowledge about these  
4 issues. So we don't think his deposition should be  
5 permitted.

6 THE COURT: But how do you know unless you ask  
7 him?

8 MS. BROWN: I think his declaration --

9 THE COURT: In other words --

10 MS. BROWN: -- is reveal --

11 THE COURT: -- if this weren't Madoff and he  
12 wasn't in prison, if you wanted to know what somebody knew,  
13 you'd establish a foundation to find out what he knew.

14 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: And I realize that the declaration  
16 submitted in the Blecker matter didn't mention profit  
17 withdrawals at all. All Mr. Madoff said was that if  
18 somebody was going to request a withdrawal, they would write  
19 a letter, I wouldn't send them money without it.

20 MS. BROWN: And --

21 THE COURT: Now I suppose that somebody could say,  
22 don't reinvest my dividends, don't send them to me, which is  
23 what the theory of the profit withdrawals were, that they  
24 were just sending the dividends from the fictitious  
25 transactions.

1 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: But that's really a question, I guess,  
3 late at the end of the day.

4 MS. BROWN: Okay.

5 THE COURT: In other words, if he testifies, look,  
6 I don't know anything about profit withdrawals, but I know  
7 that in the absence of the record request, we wouldn't send  
8 any money (indiscernible) in that business, you know, take  
9 it for what it's worth. But we don't know what he knows.

10 MS. BROWN: Yeah, we just feel that his testimony  
11 is specifically contradicted by the books and records that  
12 we have.

13 THE COURT: Doesn't that go to the weigh, though?

14 MS. BROWN: It might go to the weight.

15 And then the second issue I wanted to raise is,  
16 that within his declaration he does testify to general  
17 broker dealer practices, which I would submit he's not an  
18 appropriate witness to discuss general broker dealer  
19 practices in the industry.

20 So for those reasons we don't think his deposition  
21 should go forward.

22 THE COURT: I guess that would go to the weight  
23 also. So very specifically, I assume he -- well maybe he  
24 could or could not testify, of his own knowledge, that BLMIS  
25 would not send money to anybody unless they first requested

1 it.

2 MS. BROWN: To the extent he has that knowledge.

3 We think that there are other employees that were involved  
4 in the day to day workings of sending checks to customers,  
5 sending payments to customers, creating fictitious entries.

6 And we think they would be the most -- the employees that --

7 THE COURT: Yeah, but --

8 MS. BROWN: -- are the most knowledgeable.

9 THE COURT: -- from what I saw from your motion to  
10 extend the schedule, those people are also convicted felons  
11 who are in prison. So --

12 MS. BROWN: They are. But there -- the difference  
13 between Mr. Madoff and those employees, in addition to just  
14 the one that's obvious on its face, that Mr. Madoff is on  
15 one end of the spectrum and these employees are on another,  
16 is that these employees were actually working day to day  
17 with these payments and these transactions.

18 THE COURT: I don't necessarily disagree with you  
19 that they're better -- they will be more knowledgeable  
20 witnesses, but I can't say that Mr. Madoff doesn't know  
21 anything about this.

22 MS. BROWN: Okay. Your Honor, well then we would  
23 request that you enter the limiting order that we've  
24 outlined here today.

25 THE COURT: Yeah, I don't -- look, I'm going to

1 grant the motion. I think the information is certainly  
2 relevant to the case. There are something like 91,000 of  
3 these profit withdrawals in the records. And I read both  
4 experts' reports, Calura and Greenblatt. It's a significant  
5 issue. The trustee has attempted to reconstruct what  
6 occurred, and to a large extent, extrapolate the results of  
7 the more recent records to earlier periods, which I guess is  
8 the problem. You wouldn't even be having this discussion if  
9 we were just talking about this last ten years, I don't  
10 know. But for instance, in Mr. Blecker's case, all of his  
11 deposits and supposedly withdrawals occurred more than ten  
12 years ago when there were apparently no bank records.

13 MS. BROWN: That's correct, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: So I'll allow it, consistent with the  
15 limiting provisions which are in the Picower opposition and  
16 I'll further direct that the transcript be held  
17 confidentially for some period of time --

18 MS. BROWN: Okay.

19 THE COURT: -- since there's a lot of public  
20 interest, I guess in this. Some period of time to make --  
21 to give the parties an opportunity to make redaction  
22 requests.

23 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes.

24 THE COURT: Let's say 30 days after it's received  
25 or actually I think ECM -- ECF gives you 90 days, doesn't

1 it?

2 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: I --

3 MS. BROWN: I believe so.

4 THE COURT: How will that interfere with the  
5 progress of the litigation on this issue, if it's a full 90  
6 days?

7 MS. BROWN: The profit withdrawal issue?

8 THE COURT: No, let's split the difference, let's  
9 make it 60 days.

10 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Can -- Your Honor, can we say  
11 that or until the issues are resolved by the Court? Because  
12 if the 30-day period expires, but the issues about  
13 confidentiality or redaction haven't been addressed --

14 THE COURT: Oh, yes. The later of --

15 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes.

16 THE COURT: -- provided that a redaction request  
17 is made within 30 days, then the matter will remain  
18 confidential until those issues are resolved, certainly.

19 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: And those requests should be  
20 made to the Court under seal, I assume. Otherwise you  
21 defeat the purpose of the confidentiality.

22 THE COURT: I see. Yeah. Any objection to that,  
23 Mr. Dexter? Well how -- the other side has to know also,  
24 because they have to be able to respond.

25 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: They would be privy to the

1 motion, but they would be subject to the same  
2 confidentiality and sealing requirements.

3 THE COURT: All right. What if you do this, why  
4 don't you settle a proposed order, a notice with the various  
5 restrictions, limitations we've discussed and that'll give  
6 Ms. Chaitman and Mr. Dexter an opportunity to respond. If  
7 there are any disputes, then we can work them out.

8 MS. BROWN: And so just to clarify, the redaction  
9 request needs to be made within 30 days?

10 THE COURT: No, I said 60. I was laboring between  
11 90 and 30, so I made it 60. Requests have to be made within  
12 60 days and then the transcript will continue to remain  
13 confidential, pending the resolution of those redaction  
14 requests. The redaction requests will be filed under seal,  
15 but they will be shared with counsel who will hold them in  
16 confidence until -- you know, and then you deal with how  
17 those requests, when, and if the requests are resolved.

18 MS. BROWN: Okay.

19 THE COURT: All right?

20 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

22 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Thank you.

23 MR. DEXTER: Just so we're clear. A settlement of  
24 a proposed order is going to be circulated to determine the  
25 -- all the terms that we've just set?



1 THE COURT: You better settle it because they're  
2 not in a hurry to have the deposition taken.

3 MR. DEXTER: No, but I'm not clear on whether you  
4 ruled that the limiting orders proposed have been entered,  
5 or whether that's going to be something that we're going to  
6 have an opportunity --

7 THE COURT: No, no.

8 MR. DEXTER: -- to respond to.

9 THE COURT: There are going to be the limitations,  
10 consistent with what the Picower Parties proposed, since I  
11 think they were broader than what the trustee proposed. And  
12 they're the ones who really had the ax to grind on this one.  
13 If you object to the phraseology, they put something in,  
14 you'll certainly have an opportunity to object. But my  
15 understanding, from your reply, is that you didn't really  
16 object to the limitations that were proposed, anyway.

17 MR. DEXTER: All right. If we could, maybe may I  
18 propose we have an opportunity to submit a reply to the  
19 scope as proposed and it could just be --

20 THE COURT: No, I just ruled --

21 MR. DEXTER: -- decided on (indiscernible)?

22 THE COURT: -- I just ruled on it.

23 MR. DEXTER: Okay.

24 THE COURT: You had the opportunity. You -- did  
25 you read your papers?

1 MR. DEXTER: Yes. And --

2 THE COURT: And all your -- will you please number  
3 your pages when you submit your pleadings. You didn't  
4 number the briefs in the -- on the motion to compel.

5 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

6 Your Honor, I just want to clarify, the Picower  
7 Parties and the trustee can settle the order or --

8 THE COURT: If you want.

9 MS. BROWN: Okay.

10 THE COURT: If the order's never signed then --

11 MS. BROWN: It was a little unclear to us.

12 THE COURT: -- it's not going to be --

13 MS. BROWN: All right.

14 THE COURT: -- anybody can settle the order, I  
15 just thought that --

16 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: We can do that.

17 MS. BROWN: Your Honor, we're happy to settle the  
18 order.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes. We'll work together.

21 THE COURT: All right. Let me just -- remember  
22 that Mr. Kirby can participate.

23 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: You know what bothers me about the  
25 response, looking at it again, the reply, after you accuse

1 the Picower Parties of paranoia, notwithstanding Mr. -- the  
2 declaration submitted in the Blecker case, which included  
3 information about Picower, the last paragraph says, in any  
4 event, you respectfully asked the Court to set the  
5 limitations on the deposition of Madoff, bearing in mind the  
6 relevance of his testimony to many of the adversary  
7 proceedings and the practical difficulties of deposing him  
8 while he's in prison. How can you use this deposition in  
9 adversary proceedings if the other parties to the adversary  
10 proceedings are not -- may not be present?

11 MR. DEXTER: Well in some cases the parties are  
12 the same.

13 THE COURT: Well to the extent they're the same,  
14 then they're present.

15 MR. DEXTER: I think the point is that we should  
16 just take a couple days to clarify what exactly the scope  
17 is. And the point here is that if we're going down there,  
18 if we're going to North Carolina, it should be clear what  
19 exactly the scope is.

20 THE COURT: Let me ask -- let me raise a different  
21 issue, or a related issue. Let's suppose that in course of  
22 this profit withdrawal limitation I conclude you're wrong,  
23 where you haven't proved what you say you're going to prove.  
24 Couldn't that be used in subsequent transfer -- not -- in  
25 fraudulent transfer litigation against you to require you to

1 recompute the amount of principle that was withdrawn?

2 MS. BROWN: I mean it would be --

3 THE COURT: In other words it would -- the profit  
4 withdrawal issue has ramifications beyond the claim  
5 allowance procedures, because I assume that the trustee  
6 followed the same procedure with respect to adversary  
7 proceedings where he's seeking to recover either fictitious  
8 profits or all the principle.

9 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. I mean we've always  
10 described it as two sides of the same coin. The way that  
11 you reach each calculation is based on the same --

12 THE COURT: I'm not so sure --

13 MS. BROWN: -- transaction.

14 THE COURT: -- it is. I'll tell you why. And I  
15 raised this before. There may be a difference between the  
16 trustee's computing withdrawals for the purpose of SIPA,  
17 where he has to be personally satisfied from the books and  
18 records and the way of computing withdrawals and fraudulent  
19 transaction litigation which SIPA has nothing to do with,  
20 it's just a fraudulent transfer case.

21 MS. BROWN: Your Honor, I think that goes to the  
22 -- whose burden it is. I don't think it goes to the actual  
23 calculation. And under SIPA it's the customer's burden to  
24 substantiate their claims, similar to any preferred status  
25 in any bankruptcy.

1 THE COURT: I guess I'm raising a different issue.

2 MS. BROWN: Okay.

3 THE COURT: Suppose the trustee says, you know  
4 what, I just don't believe Madoff, I don't believe  
5 Bongiorno, depending on what she says about this, or Crupi,  
6 depending on what she says about this, I believe my expert.  
7 And based on my expert's analysis and the extrapolation of  
8 that analysis, I believe that PW represents an actual  
9 withdrawal from the account.

10 Is that enough, even if I think that maybe Madoff,  
11 let's use an example, Bongiorno and Crupi are right, in  
12 other words, as long as the trustee reasonably relies on the  
13 information he has, does it matter if he's right? Because  
14 he would have to be in a fraudulent transfer litigation  
15 where his reasonable reliance is (indiscernible) really an  
16 issue.

17 MS. BROWN: Well I think the Second Circuit case  
18 law on the trustee's duties and obligations gives the  
19 trustee some -- wide latitude in determining that equity,  
20 and it may not be the same burden in a fraudulent transfer  
21 action. But I do think that goes to burdens and not the  
22 underlying calculation.

23 THE COURT: I'm not so sure, but we'll see.

24 All right. You can settle an order.

25 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Thank you.  
2 THE COURT: Thank you.  
3 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor.  
4 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at  
5 12:49 PM)  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

RULINGS

Page Line

Motions to Dismiss are Denied. 71 3-4

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing  
transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Sonya  
Ledanski Hyde

Digitally signed by Sonya Ledanski  
Hyde  
DN: cn=Sonya Ledanski Hyde,  
o=Veritext, ou,  
email=digital@veritext.com, c=US  
Date: 2016.03.24 11:01:08 -04'00'

Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Veritext Legal Solutions

330 Old Country Road

Suite 300

Mineola, NY 11501

Date: March 23, 2016



[& - account]

Page 1

<b>&amp;</b>	<b>16</b> 11:19	<b>25th</b> 57:1 70:9,10	<b>57892</b> 57:24
<b>&amp;</b> 4:12 5:1,8	<b>169</b> 59:4	<b>26</b> 23:13,14 38:4	<b>6</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>16th</b> 24:15	41:23 43:14,22 45:7	<b>60</b> 86:9 87:10,11,12
<b>0086</b> 36:25	<b>18</b> 52:8	52:6	<b>63,259</b> 63:25
<b>0118</b> 35:19,21 36:12	<b>184</b> 62:1	<b>26th</b> 52:21 57:4	<b>6th</b> 70:1
<b>0324</b> 36:24	<b>186</b> 62:1	<b>27</b> 12:5 50:14	<b>7</b>
<b>08-01789</b> 1:3 3:1,4	<b>18th</b> 8:15 21:24	<b>27th</b> 41:4 70:11,13	<b>71</b> 94:6
3:7	51:25 54:6,24 56:24	<b>28th</b> 24:15	<b>76</b> 63:23
<b>0866</b> 37:1	<b>19</b> 59:8	<b>298</b> 62:1	<b>78</b> 64:7,9
<b>1</b>	<b>1975</b> 57:20	<b>2nd</b> 11:8	<b>79</b> 64:8,9
	<b>1995</b> 59:17	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1</b> 61:24	<b>1996</b> 59:5	<b>3</b> 52:7 53:13 57:11	<b>8</b> 46:24,25 61:24
<b>10</b> 36:8	<b>1999</b> 37:6	61:8	<b>81</b> 63:25
<b>10-04324</b> 2:2 3:13	<b>19th</b> 8:8 11:9,23	<b>3-4</b> 94:6	<b>82</b> 64:8
<b>10-04898</b> 1:11 3:10	55:6	<b>30</b> 9:14 49:24 50:18	<b>9</b>
<b>100</b> 38:21	<b>1s0324</b> 35:18	51:22 53:17 54:20	<b>90</b> 85:25 86:5 87:11
<b>10004</b> 2:14	<b>2</b>	66:16 69:6 70:6	<b>91,000</b> 85:2
<b>10022</b> 4:7 5:11	<b>2</b> 11:20	85:24 86:12,17 87:9	<b>919</b> 5:10
<b>10036</b> 5:4	<b>2000</b> 13:18	87:11	<b>99</b> 16:16
<b>10111</b> 4:17	<b>2001</b> 9:25	<b>300</b> 95:22	<b>9th</b> 32:13
<b>1026013</b> 61:24	<b>2003</b> 39:12 40:9	<b>31</b> 50:11	<b>a</b>
<b>10:40</b> 2:17	58:13	<b>324</b> 63:22 64:12	<b>aaron</b> 4:4 74:20
<b>11</b> 6:20 7:18 12:7,7	<b>2004</b> 19:15,19,21	<b>330</b> 95:21	<b>abeyance</b> 66:15
49:19 50:7 51:17	20:4 23:5,10 27:12	<b>3652764</b> 59:8	<b>abide</b> 46:7
79:5	27:15,17,21 28:3,10	<b>37</b> 8:4 52:22 53:7	<b>ability</b> 43:22
<b>1121</b> 57:19	42:21,22 45:1	56:7	<b>able</b> 31:5,23 44:10
<b>1126</b> 57:20	<b>2006</b> 7:5 12:7,11	<b>3rd</b> 52:15 53:13	44:16 86:24
<b>1127</b> 59:16	34:15	54:4	<b>absence</b> 51:16
<b>11501</b> 95:23	<b>2006-2008</b> 33:17	<b>4</b>	56:23 57:16 83:7
<b>11th</b> 12:11 51:11	<b>2007</b> 11:8,21 39:13	<b>4</b> 53:13	<b>absent</b> 52:4 54:12
52:25 54:10,17,25	<b>2008</b> 11:9,24 12:7	<b>41</b> 8:5 52:22 53:9,11	55:2
56:21	13:5,5,18 34:15	56:8	<b>absolute</b> 59:9
<b>1211</b> 5:3	39:13 50:7	<b>41.5</b> 53:13	<b>absolutely</b> 70:20
<b>125,000</b> 11:8,24	<b>2009</b> 7:6 39:13	<b>410,000</b> 12:5	73:6
13:15 63:1	50:12 61:23,24	<b>42</b> 16:3	<b>academic</b> 44:25
<b>12:49</b> 93:5	<b>2011</b> 59:8,8 70:2	<b>43,096</b> 63:24	<b>accept</b> 13:7 25:1
<b>13</b> 51:18	<b>2013</b> 57:24,24	<b>44</b> 59:5	<b>acceptable</b> 66:1
<b>13,266</b> 36:13	<b>2014</b> 53:13 62:1	<b>45</b> 4:16 57:11	<b>access</b> 45:24 46:7
<b>130,000</b> 65:5	<b>2016</b> 2:16 50:14	<b>465</b> 4:6	<b>accomplish</b> 62:20
<b>14</b> 51:19,23 72:15	51:11,17 52:7,8	<b>48</b> 59:5	62:21
72:19,24 73:3	54:24 61:8 95:25	<b>4th</b> 57:24	<b>accomplished</b> 32:6
<b>140,000</b> 12:10 63:5	<b>21</b> 11:25 12:3,16	<b>5</b>	<b>account</b> 11:20,23
<b>15</b> 11:22 12:3,15	<b>22</b> 11:22 61:7	<b>5</b> 57:24 59:8	12:6,8,10 25:16
37:2 51:24	<b>22nd</b> 70:12	<b>513</b> 57:19	26:1,4,7,8,14 27:4,8
<b>150,000</b> 11:8,21	<b>23</b> 2:16 95:25	<b>550</b> 23:12 43:17	35:17,18,21 36:10
13:14 63:1 65:5	<b>25</b> 52:5		

[account - aside]

Page 2

36:12,18,25,25 37:1 37:2 54:12 61:2,6 63:22 64:9,11,12 65:10 66:8 92:9 <b>accountant</b> 10:7,12 10:15 61:13 62:18 <b>accountant's</b> 10:3,9 61:14 62:16 <b>accounts</b> 35:17,17 35:20 36:11 37:3 58:10 59:23 63:16 63:17 64:3 65:4 <b>accuracy</b> 59:25 60:6 65:7 <b>accurate</b> 60:2 95:4 <b>accuse</b> 89:25 <b>accused</b> 51:2,7 <b>achieved</b> 22:17 <b>acknowledged</b> 24:11,12 74:2 <b>acknowledging</b> 74:25 <b>action</b> 53:10 79:23 92:21 <b>actions</b> 7:18 50:25 <b>actual</b> 91:22 92:8 <b>ad</b> 49:7 <b>added</b> 45:21 <b>addition</b> 25:10 54:3 55:9 63:9 79:16 84:13 <b>additional</b> 32:6 51:1 78:23 <b>address</b> 55:24 56:10 77:19 <b>addressed</b> 17:20 86:13 <b>adherence</b> 56:18 <b>adjectives</b> 40:20 <b>adjourn</b> 66:16 67:22,24 70:14 <b>adjourned</b> 69:10 70:6 <b>adjourning</b> 69:5 <b>adjustment</b> 58:7 <b>administrative</b> 59:15	<b>admission</b> 7:12 10:9 14:3 22:16 23:1,17 30:11 31:16,25 33:3 33:6 34:13,22 36:12 38:22 51:8,23 52:10 52:11,17 61:15 62:15,17 64:7 67:10 <b>admissions</b> 8:12 9:4 13:4,6 21:12 22:7 22:10,12,13,24 23:10 29:15,24 30:2 31:4 35:6 37:16,17 39:3 49:25 50:20 52:14 53:5,18 54:21 55:19,22,23 58:9 61:11 67:9,16 <b>admit</b> 7:23,24 8:2 8:11 9:17 10:14 11:19,22 12:5 13:5 13:9,11,11,12,20,23 20:16 24:19 25:13 34:19 37:19,21 38:15 39:2 53:3 60:7 61:11 62:23 <b>admits</b> 20:18 61:3 <b>admitted</b> 7:6 9:15 13:18 36:3,7,14,16 36:19 50:21 61:9 63:18 64:3,5 65:1,5 65:13 <b>admonition</b> 58:17 <b>adopting</b> 43:14 <b>adv</b> 1:3,11 2:2 <b>advance</b> 7:21 8:10 9:1,5 24:18 34:18 49:4 <b>advancing</b> 22:22 <b>adverbs</b> 40:20 <b>adversary</b> 19:18,23 27:23 42:18 45:3 49:19,21 50:4,21 51:9 52:18 53:2 54:9 90:6,9,9 91:6 <b>advise</b> 51:3 70:15 <b>advocated</b> 56:18 <b>affect</b> 63:6 68:17	<b>affirmative</b> 14:16 14:22 15:16,17 16:1 16:3,9,12 20:21 39:7,9,10,15,21 40:3,8 50:24 58:5 60:10 63:10 65:1 <b>agencies</b> 79:24 <b>agent</b> 15:4 <b>ago</b> 40:6 45:25 85:12 <b>agree</b> 17:24 22:15 31:13 32:5 33:15,22 34:9,11,20,23 41:18 42:20 43:5 55:7 75:3 <b>agreeable</b> 78:1,2 <b>agreed</b> 17:4 29:7 34:21 56:4 60:19 <b>agreement</b> 24:10,11 54:5 <b>ahead</b> 6:23 24:1 77:6 81:20,20 <b>al</b> 2:8 4:5 <b>allegation</b> 41:15 <b>alleged</b> 49:22 50:4 <b>allegedly</b> 54:2 <b>allow</b> 20:6 33:6 37:7 38:6,8 42:8 72:13 78:14 85:14 <b>allowance</b> 91:5 <b>allowed</b> 23:14 35:2 <b>allowing</b> 43:13 <b>alluded</b> 23:7 <b>alpern</b> 52:2 <b>alternatively</b> 56:14 <b>amend</b> 38:19 40:11 <b>amended</b> 52:14 54:4 <b>americas</b> 5:3 <b>amount</b> 11:21,24 26:7 63:7 91:1 <b>amounts</b> 50:6 <b>analysis</b> 92:7,8 <b>andrew</b> 43:25 <b>ands</b> 87:17 <b>announced</b> 22:14 27:16	<b>answer</b> 7:22,24 8:1 9:2,23 11:22,22,25 12:7 14:17 20:25 22:3 29:23,25 31:4 35:24 40:9,11 41:21 63:23 <b>answers</b> 9:12,14,16 9:17 11:19 12:2 23:23,23 33:16 34:2 34:10,14,18,25 35:8 38:19 41:21 <b>anybody</b> 35:11 83:25 89:14 <b>anyway</b> 88:16 <b>apparently</b> 29:12 39:17 50:17 85:12 <b>appeal</b> 72:10,11,12 73:10 <b>appearance</b> 45:9 <b>appeared</b> 54:18 <b>applicable</b> 24:23 46:20 <b>application</b> 3:7 <b>applies</b> 39:11 60:22 <b>apply</b> 39:22 42:11 47:1 56:10 <b>appreciate</b> 71:22 <b>apprise</b> 72:17 <b>approach</b> 53:22 <b>appropriate</b> 16:5,7 27:17 31:14 53:23 55:13 77:11 83:18 <b>appropriately</b> 17:1 <b>april</b> 11:8,20 61:24 70:8 <b>areas</b> 10:19 <b>aren't</b> 15:11 27:3 <b>argue</b> 57:7 58:23 <b>argued</b> 52:23 <b>arguing</b> 13:19 31:9 37:20 <b>argument</b> 9:22 18:4 65:21 <b>arises</b> 50:12 <b>arties</b> 79:1 <b>aside</b> 32:10 42:17 67:5
---	--	---	--

[asked - cases]

Page 3

asked 16:14 80:7 90:4 asking 33:11 65:11 75:2,2,5 76:14,19 aspect 49:14 assert 14:22 16:3 39:19 57:9 asserted 14:9 16:2 50:24 58:6,19 64:15 asserting 58:13 assertion 60:12 assume 34:18 35:3 83:23 86:20 91:5 assuming 34:24 attacking 40:23 attempt 37:13 73:10 attempted 85:5 attending 80:22 attention 45:20 46:13 attorney 4:4,13 5:2 5:9 47:18 50:15 attorneys 17:3,6 45:17 51:6 attributable 58:15 attributed 51:1 august 59:8 authoritative 74:2 authority 18:9 53:19 authorize 53:9 authorized 56:22 authorizes 53:7 avenue 4:6 5:3,10 avoid 43:3 avoidance 42:17 await 56:4 aware 8:18 26:16 ax 88:12	badway 46:2 73:10 baker 4:12 80:14 balance 59:12 bank 5:2 6:19 10:21 25:7,11,15,16 26:25 27:3,3 32:11 35:10 37:8,14 47:19 48:6 49:24 50:13,23 51:3 51:21 53:2 54:8 56:2,6 57:6 58:1,2 59:7,20,23 60:4,9 60:14,18,19,25 61:1 61:1,22 65:3,8,15 65:22 66:5,6,7,17 66:18,21,23,23,25 70:24 71:9 73:11 85:12 bankruptcy 1:1 2:12,25 59:8 91:25 banks 23:11 45:9 50:9 51:12 52:1 54:11,25 55:1,7,8 69:9,25 70:16 bar 20:3 23:13 46:12,14 barbanel 37:4,5,6,7 37:9 38:11,12,13,23 52:2 55:14 64:19,19 69:21 barbara 3:14 6:11 barcelona 77:23 barry 5:6 71:8 based 7:19 32:14 49:22 62:11 91:11 92:7 baseless 40:20 42:2 basically 25:13 basis 15:3 17:18 23:18 32:10 41:24 42:6,9 57:6 67:14 69:14 bear 59:2 67:4 bearing 90:5 beginning 50:10 66:8 behalf 71:8 76:10	believe 24:25 27:14 27:24 60:1 70:13 73:24 86:3 92:4,4,6 92:8 bell 5:18 bench 22:14 bencher 33:13 benefit 13:24 26:21 bernard 1:8,13 2:4 3:5 4:14,20 48:1 78:5 bernstein 2:24 best 38:5 better 42:23,24 84:19 88:1 beyond 91:4 bin 21:14 blecker 4:4 74:20 75:17,19 82:16 90:2 blecker's 74:22 85:10 blmis 58:11,24 59:21 60:2,6 63:11 65:8,24 83:24 board 67:20,24 boat 59:4 bongiorno 92:5,11 book 62:1 books 23:2 62:1 83:11 91:17 bothered 34:12 bothers 89:24 bottom 44:8 bowling 2:13 breed 61:21 brief 6:25 28:12 48:16,17,21 77:25 briefed 28:7,13 briefing 48:22 briefs 73:19 89:4 broader 88:11 broker 83:17,18 brought 21:9 79:23 brown 4:21 76:9,10 76:23 77:5,7 80:8 80:12,14,20,22 81:2 81:18,21 82:2,8,10	82:14,20 83:1,4,10 83:14 84:2,8,12,22 85:13,18 86:3,7 87:8,18,20 89:5,9 89:11,13,17,23 91:2 91:9,13,21 92:2,17 92:25 brunswick 59:4 burden 13:13 15:15 57:23 59:3 60:17 91:22,23 92:20 burdens 92:21 burdensome 15:11 16:11,13 business 44:11 83:8
<b>c</b>			
c 4:1 6:1 95:1,1 calculation 91:11 91:23 92:22 calendar 73:15 call 17:20 68:10,13 called 41:5 calura 85:4 carolina 81:16 90:18 case 1:3,11 2:2 6:22 7:11 9:3 10:8,10 11:1,4 15:2 16:17 19:7 20:7,10 22:23 25:5 29:10,24 33:3 34:19 38:11 39:8,9 39:21 42:2,13,19,25 43:6 44:5 46:20,21 46:23,23,25 47:1,13 47:15,23,25,25 48:2 48:4,6,8 50:17 54:7 54:22 59:17 60:2,3 67:11 68:21 73:22 78:11 85:2,10 90:2 91:20 92:17 cases 6:21 7:25 11:2 16:2 20:23 21:14,15 21:23,25 22:1,10,15 24:2,4 26:13 31:24 33:18 38:21 39:5 42:2 49:14 52:3,12 52:19,23 54:1,1			

[cases - consistent]

Page 4

55:23 56:1,25 57:25 59:9 62:25 69:6,21 75:6 80:7 90:11 cause 6:6 22:22 30:14 43:11,12 44:13 56:14,15 cavalierly 41:14 century 45:25 certain 11:17 13:7 23:17 35:7 49:24 50:25 56:10 certainly 19:12 20:24 25:1,17 26:24 36:9,24 43:23 48:12 48:16 74:8 85:1 86:18 88:14 certified 95:3 chaitman 3:13 4:3 4:10 6:15 9:18,18 9:20 17:15 18:22 20:5 21:22 22:10 23:7 24:6,8 25:21 25:23 26:2,10,16 27:9,19,23 28:6,11 29:2 30:6 35:23,25 36:16,22 39:24 40:22 41:14 42:12 42:12 49:20,20 51:1 51:3,5,7 52:6,21 53:14 55:19 69:13 76:16 77:9,16,19,22 79:21 87:6 chaitman's 22:24 challenge 57:21 challenged 59:25 challenging 65:7 chambers 24:10,11 50:14 51:7 chance 33:6 change 33:9,12 changed 25:3 33:25 changing 24:24 characterization 11:17 characterized 13:17 charged 41:13	chart 21:19,21 check 26:7 64:1,14 checks 84:4 choice 61:3 chrysler 57:19 circle 28:21 circuit 18:9 26:22 57:20 59:16 92:17 circulated 87:24 circumvent 27:15 cited 53:19 59:17 civil 8:5 27:13 52:22 57:11 claim 57:9,10,16 65:21 66:9,12 91:4 claims 60:15 91:24 clarify 9:9 25:11 87:8 89:6 90:16 clarity 44:16 clear 18:3 30:10 39:10 40:7 70:24 87:23 88:3 90:18 clearly 18:11 49:4 clerk 70:9 client 25:15 clients 22:24 23:1 80:18 close 21:7 closed 58:22 59:14 cohen 22:18 cohmad 46:1,20 72:9 73:7,8 coin 91:10 colleague 22:3 colleagues 21:8 41:9 collecting 57:25 59:9 colloquy 9:13 colonial 43:2 come 24:6 28:6 40:18 41:20 45:2 70:8 71:17 comes 17:14 41:14 coming 25:1 67:20 77:24	commence 45:3 commenced 50:4 commercial 33:14 commit 48:1 commitment 51:21 committed 53:12 communications 8:23,24 company 61:23 compel 3:10 6:19 21:24 29:21 49:24 51:18 56:5 62:24 64:18,23 66:15 70:24 89:4 compelling 53:9 compensation 44:20 complaining 14:18 complaint 27:20 42:10 49:9 57:9 complaints 7:17 17:12 complete 66:24 compliance 8:25 21:25 22:5 30:17 31:3,6 33:7 40:3 49:24 51:18 52:5,20 53:1,25 54:7,14,24 55:15 56:6,22,25 62:22,24 63:21 64:18,24 66:15 69:5 69:24 71:10 73:11 79:19 complicated 8:19 comply 3:11 6:19 25:3 34:4 51:4 53:8 53:10 54:11 55:1 computation 63:7 computing 65:17 91:16,18 conceded 25:13 conceding 45:4 concern 74:16 concerns 11:18 50:16 60:17 62:3,12 74:15	concession 50:25 conclude 34:18 90:22 concluded 62:2 93:4 conclusion 60:22 78:19 concord 59:4 condition 66:5 conditions 77:17,25 78:2,20,21 79:9 conduct 7:20 54:2 73:16,20 conducted 56:20 74:14 conduit 14:12 15:4 64:16 confer 51:13 55:6 56:16,20 conference 24:14 50:14 51:7,10 55:1 55:6,9 56:16 70:15 conferences 56:21 confidence 17:5 47:11 62:9 69:25 87:16 confidential 45:16 45:17 60:20 79:18 86:18 87:13 confidentiality 17:1 17:9 49:3 71:12 86:13,21 87:2 confidentially 85:17 confirmed 51:20 confusing 30:9 48:10 confusion 55:12 congress 43:15,21 43:22 connection 21:22 55:25 consent 76:20 78:5 consisted 12:8 consistent 10:2,18 61:12 62:16 71:12 78:3,6 85:14 88:10
---	--	---	--

[contacting - defendant's]

Page 5

<b>contacting</b> 51:3,12 55:7,8	<b>course</b> 16:8 30:22 90:21	69:4,9,13,20 70:4 70:10,12,14,19,21	70:15 73:3 95:25
<b>contained</b> 35:6 58:2 58:3	<b>court</b> 1:1 2:12 6:2,7 6:9,18,20 7:2,8,16	71:1,3,7,14,16,19 71:24 72:2,5,7,11	<b>dated</b> 52:6 56:24 61:7
<b>contempt</b> 41:13 51:6	8:3,4,6,7,14,20 9:3 9:11,20 10:2,6,13	72:12,15,17,19,23 72:25 73:2,4,7,13	<b>david</b> 4:19
<b>contend</b> 58:12	10:23 11:2,7,16	73:23 74:1,4,11,15	<b>davis</b> 52:6
<b>contends</b> 61:19	12:4,17,20 13:1,10	75:2,16,19,23 76:2	<b>day</b> 8:15,16,22 23:5 41:9 51:6 72:15,19
<b>contest</b> 38:24	13:19,25 14:6,21	76:5,7,22,24 77:6	83:3 84:4,4,16,16 86:12
<b>context</b> 8:23 11:13 18:21 26:18 29:6	15:1,9,13,19 16:2	77:17,20,22 78:9,13	<b>days</b> 9:14 34:4 49:25 50:18 51:22
42:1 44:14 61:22 71:9 77:14	16:13,19,24 17:4,13	78:16,24 79:7,9,14	53:17 54:20 66:16
<b>continuation</b> 6:5	17:15,24 18:1,7,13	80:1,6,9,13,16,21	69:6 70:6 71:21
<b>continue</b> 20:12 28:15 87:12	18:16,19,23 19:1,4	80:25 81:3,3,9,12	72:24 73:3 78:7
<b>contract</b> 14:10 15:7 58:21 63:12	19:7,11,13,20,24	81:17,20,25 82:6,9	85:24,25 86:6,9,17
<b>contradicted</b> 83:11	20:9,14,25 21:3,11	82:11,15,21 83:2,5	87:9,12 90:16
<b>contravenes</b> 30:23 31:7 61:15	21:14,19,21 22:5	83:13,22 84:7,9,18	<b>deal</b> 7:9 20:16,20 28:5 67:8 87:16
<b>control</b> 26:8 58:24	23:15 24:5,16,21,22	84:25 85:14,19,24	<b>dealer</b> 83:17,18
<b>convenience</b> 24:13	25:1,21,24 26:6,13	86:4,8,11,14,16,20	<b>dealing</b> 38:21 44:1 75:13
<b>conversation</b> 39:23	27:3,17,18,21 28:1	86:22 87:3,10,19,21	<b>dealt</b> 45:18 47:4,6 62:14
<b>convicted</b> 84:10	28:9,14,17,23,25	88:1,7,9,20,22,24	<b>debtor</b> 73:21
<b>copy</b> 11:12 72:23	29:4,11,17 30:4,7	89:2,8,10,12,14,19	<b>deceased</b> 21:1 52:18
<b>corporation</b> 1:5 57:19 59:4	30:13,19,21 31:1,9	89:21,24 90:4,13,20	<b>deceive</b> 34:2
<b>correct</b> 32:3 43:8 45:10 64:22 85:13	31:13,21 32:4,18,21	91:3,12,14 92:1,3	<b>december</b> 12:6,7,11 50:7,11 52:14
<b>correctly</b> 46:4	32:23 33:1,4,9,11	92:23 93:2	<b>decide</b> 47:21
<b>corresponding</b> 36:10	33:12,22 34:5,9,17	<b>court's</b> 24:24 32:12 52:3,25 53:12 54:8 54:17,25 58:17	<b>decided</b> 24:22 47:22 88:21
<b>corrupting</b> 42:4	35:2,11,14,16,24	<b>courthouse</b> 45:15	<b>decides</b> 38:1
<b>cottle</b> 76:16	36:10,19,24 37:11	<b>courts</b> 59:5	<b>declaration</b> 52:6 61:6 74:20 75:12,14
<b>counsel</b> 3:14 22:19 23:4,6,24 29:24	37:15,20 38:1,4,10	<b>cover</b> 35:12	75:22,25 81:22 82:8
55:20 67:20,21,24	38:15,19 39:4,16,23	<b>covered</b> 35:12	82:15 83:16 90:2
68:4,5,9,22 69:1	40:2,5,10,13,16	<b>covers</b> 6:20,21 39:4	<b>defeat</b> 86:21
76:13 79:13,17 80:9 87:15	41:11,14,20 42:16	<b>created</b> 41:23	<b>defects</b> 53:7
<b>count</b> 64:17	43:5,9 44:4,7,12,18	<b>creating</b> 84:5	<b>defendant</b> 1:9,18 2:9 9:24 28:16
<b>counterbalance</b> 60:11	44:21,25 45:6,8,12	<b>credit</b> 12:9 63:4	38:22 46:22 48:8
<b>country</b> 95:21	46:6,17 47:2,9,14	<b>crummy</b> 43:25,25	50:21,24 54:3 58:6
<b>couple</b> 90:16	47:18 48:3,9,16,17	<b>crupi</b> 92:5,11	58:18 60:5,24 61:9
	48:21 49:6,10,13,16	<b>current</b> 50:12	62:11 65:7 66:6 68:10
	49:18,23 51:2,10,11	<b>customer's</b> 91:23	<b>defendant's</b> 12:20 20:1 52:9 53:6
	51:14,15,20 52:24	<b>customers</b> 73:19 75:10 78:5 84:4,5	
	53:7,10,11,14,21	<b>cyber</b> 45:20	
	54:2,10 55:3,6,10		
	55:17,24 56:5,10,17		
	56:20 57:13 59:11		
	62:2,12 63:20 64:6		
	64:9,12,23 65:9,13		
	65:15 66:1,4,14,21		
	67:1,4,7,16,22,25		
	68:2,5,15,20,24		

[defendant's - dropped]

Page 6

54:23 62:4 65:25 <b>defendants</b> 3:1 4:5 6:13,15,25 7:2,6,22 7:23,25 8:11 9:1 11:4 14:9 16:16 17:1 18:3 22:16 24:19 33:6 35:9 47:23 49:1,19 50:1 50:3,5,8 53:2,19 54:15 55:13 56:2,14 57:2,5,25 58:4,10 58:12,16,23 59:1,17 59:18,22,22,25 60:1 60:4,6,12,15 62:6,9 63:9 65:22 <b>defense</b> 14:9,17,22 15:13,16,17 16:4,5 24:3 39:9,10,11,15 39:19,22,24 40:3,8 50:24 58:13,17,19 58:23 63:11 64:15 65:1 <b>defenses</b> 16:1,3,9,12 20:21 39:8 58:5 60:10 <b>defer</b> 20:5 <b>delay</b> 67:11 <b>delivered</b> 51:22 <b>demand</b> 52:5 54:14 <b>demanding</b> 53:25 54:24 <b>denial</b> 11:16 60:15 61:16 <b>denied</b> 11:7,22,25 12:7 32:13 35:18,22 36:6,20,24 37:1,3 50:2 56:8 63:1,2,16 63:24,25 64:1,13,13 64:20 71:4 94:6 <b>denies</b> 37:15 <b>deny</b> 10:14 11:10 13:14 24:19 39:17 48:3 63:2 <b>denying</b> 33:17,18 69:22 <b>depending</b> 92:5,6	<b>depose</b> 75:1 78:5 <b>deposed</b> 74:23 <b>deposing</b> 90:7 <b>deposit</b> 26:13 <b>deposited</b> 10:16 58:11 59:22 61:5 <b>deposition</b> 3:4 6:4 6:12 70:22 73:14,16 73:20 74:14,16 75:4 75:7 76:12 79:19 80:22 81:13,14,19 81:21 82:1,4 83:20 88:2 90:5,8 <b>deposits</b> 11:5 12:10 13:18 20:19 36:14 37:5 50:9 53:4 63:5 63:5 65:2 85:11 <b>deprive</b> 61:21 <b>described</b> 91:10 <b>designed</b> 34:1 45:2 <b>despite</b> 58:17 <b>destroy</b> 43:19 <b>determination</b> 16:21 38:5 56:4 73:24 <b>determinations</b> 74:1 <b>determine</b> 8:12 37:8 87:24 <b>determined</b> 28:8 <b>determining</b> 92:19 <b>devices</b> 38:8 <b>dexter</b> 4:9 6:14,15 6:24 7:4,13,19 8:7 8:17,21 9:7,23,24 10:4,11,17,24 11:3 11:11 12:2,15,18,25 13:3,16,23 14:5,15 14:23 15:6,11,15,22 16:7,15,22,25 17:10 17:14,22 18:3,10,15 18:18,22 19:2,5,12 19:16,21 20:5,12,24 21:17 28:15,21,24 30:4,8,17,20,22 31:12,17 32:3,12,19 32:23 33:4,15,24	34:8,14,24 35:5,13 35:15 37:5,12,18,21 37:23 38:3,13,17,20 39:7,21 40:1,7,12 40:15 45:14 46:18 46:19 47:5,12,23 48:4,15,19,25 49:7 64:4,5,7,11,22 66:1 66:2,11 69:17,19 72:6,8,13,16,22 73:18,25 74:8,12,24 75:8,18,21,24 76:3 76:6 77:1,18,21 78:2,11,14 79:1,4 81:15 86:23 87:6,23 88:3,8,17,21,23 89:1 90:11,15 93:3 <b>dictated</b> 57:2 <b>difference</b> 84:12 86:8 91:15 <b>different</b> 13:25 17:13 18:13 31:21 36:1 48:11 90:20 92:1 <b>difficulties</b> 90:7 <b>direct</b> 81:6 85:16 <b>directed</b> 51:13 57:18 <b>directing</b> 69:23 <b>direction</b> 52:4 54:2 <b>directly</b> 51:12 62:12 <b>disagree</b> 23:12 30:6 31:12 32:25 84:18 <b>disappearing</b> 23:6,8 43:15 <b>disclosure</b> 50:9 57:14 60:20 <b>disclosures</b> 57:6 <b>discovery</b> 15:21,22 16:5,7,8 18:20 19:14 20:1,2,4 21:22 22:1 27:1,12 27:20,25 28:3,4 32:15,18,20 38:7 42:1,7,9,10,14,16 42:18 43:4,12 46:12 49:8 53:9 55:11	56:17 <b>discretion</b> 53:12 <b>discuss</b> 47:20 83:18 <b>discussed</b> 67:14 87:5 <b>discussion</b> 24:7 44:25 85:8 <b>dismiss</b> 7:17,18,19 19:5 49:14,21 50:2 52:23 53:6,10 56:1 56:7 71:3 72:21 94:6 <b>dismissal</b> 3:2 53:11 53:20 54:9 <b>dismissed</b> 42:14 57:10 72:20 <b>disposition</b> 55:16 <b>dispute</b> 7:1,3 9:25 10:20,22 11:1,4 13:17 25:9 46:20 50:12 55:10,11 60:5 74:22 <b>disputed</b> 10:10 13:8 13:12 60:7 <b>disputes</b> 7:11 10:20 55:9 87:7 <b>dissatisfied</b> 9:15 <b>district</b> 1:2 72:12 73:4 <b>dividends</b> 82:22,24 <b>docket</b> 68:13 <b>documentary</b> 25:14 <b>documents</b> 11:12 16:9 25:7,10,18 62:5 69:24 71:11 <b>dog</b> 62:1 <b>doing</b> 26:17 27:25 29:14 36:10 42:4 43:21 <b>dominion</b> 26:8 58:24 <b>don</b> 18:22 <b>doubts</b> 49:1 <b>drastic</b> 53:11,22 <b>drawn</b> 55:21 <b>dropped</b> 15:18
--	---	---	--

[duplicative - fixed]

Page 7

<b>duplicative</b> 59:24	<b>entitled</b> 27:2,11,24	<b>expecting</b> 68:11	<b>fault</b> 31:5 33:23
<b>duties</b> 92:18	31:18 47:24 58:6	<b>expedite</b> 24:4	<b>fdic</b> 59:16
<b>e</b>	60:8 75:4 76:17	<b>expensive</b> 30:16	<b>february</b> 8:8,15
<b>e</b> 2:23,23 4:1,1 6:1,1	80:16,18	<b>expert</b> 92:6	21:24 24:15 30:25
94:1 95:1	<b>entity</b> 21:4	<b>expert's</b> 92:7	51:11,17,25 52:5,6
<b>earlier</b> 8:9 69:1	<b>entries</b> 74:6,7,13	<b>experts</b> 85:4	52:8,15,21,25 54:4
85:7	84:5	<b>expired</b> 52:10 54:6	54:6,10,17,24,25
<b>ecf</b> 85:25	<b>entry</b> 73:3	54:23	55:6 56:21,24 57:1
<b>echo</b> 42:11	<b>equitable</b> 58:7	<b>expires</b> 86:12	57:4 61:7
<b>ecm</b> 85:25	<b>equity</b> 92:19	<b>explain</b> 12:2	<b>federal</b> 8:5 14:15
<b>edition</b> 53:13	<b>esq</b> 4:13	<b>explained</b> 55:20	27:13 35:5 38:3
<b>education</b> 57:23	<b>essence</b> 67:12	<b>exposed</b> 17:2,3	52:22 53:13 57:11
<b>effect</b> 69:15	<b>essentially</b> 7:20	<b>extend</b> 84:10	<b>feel</b> 81:21 83:10
<b>effective</b> 22:25	47:9 62:18	<b>extended</b> 29:9	<b>feels</b> 40:24
<b>effectively</b> 61:16	<b>establish</b> 15:17 16:1	<b>extension</b> 28:20,25	<b>felons</b> 84:10
<b>efforts</b> 50:12	16:11 82:13	29:17,19	<b>fiasco</b> 41:23
<b>eight</b> 71:24	<b>established</b> 18:5	<b>extensions</b> 29:16	<b>fictitious</b> 50:4,5
<b>either</b> 10:11,14	47:1 49:4	<b>extent</b> 10:2,17	58:8,15 63:7 65:18
50:19 53:3 57:8	<b>establishing</b> 25:19	14:10 25:18 33:12	82:24 84:5 91:7
60:2 91:7	<b>et</b> 2:8 4:4	50:23 55:25 58:7	<b>fiduciary</b> 46:6
<b>eliciting</b> 75:5	<b>event</b> 30:18 45:11	59:19 61:11 62:15	<b>fighting</b> 67:16
<b>ellman</b> 5:1	90:4	77:12 84:2 85:6	<b>filed</b> 57:2 60:23
<b>employees</b> 84:3,6	<b>everybody</b> 30:16	90:13	80:2 87:14
84:13,15,16	65:1	<b>extraordinary</b>	<b>files</b> 27:23
<b>encompassed</b> 16:4	<b>everyone's</b> 15:25	26:18	<b>filing</b> 19:17,22 50:7
36:9	<b>evidence</b> 14:19,21	<b>extrapolate</b> 85:6	50:11 56:17
<b>enforce</b> 21:15,24	14:23 15:16,23	<b>extrapolation</b> 92:7	<b>filter</b> 46:2
31:15,23 32:1 41:7	25:14 50:17 60:8	<b>f</b>	<b>finally</b> 51:20 79:25
50:13,18 51:16,21	<b>evidenced</b> 11:5	<b>f</b> 2:23 95:1	<b>financial</b> 15:6 16:16
52:4 53:16 54:19	<b>evident</b> 81:9	<b>f.2d</b> 57:19	17:23 18:11 31:19
63:20	<b>eviscerate</b> 56:19	<b>f.3d</b> 59:16	33:21 59:7,11,18
<b>enforcement</b> 3:8	<b>ex</b> 27:24	<b>face</b> 9:16 84:14	60:13
6:10 54:5	<b>exactly</b> 27:21 90:16	<b>fact</b> 8:21 50:1 52:10	<b>find</b> 20:17 35:14
<b>enforcing</b> 33:7	90:19	60:7,9 75:11	43:13,20,23 74:14
50:22	<b>examination</b> 19:15	<b>facts</b> 47:12 50:19	82:13
<b>enjoyed</b> 26:20	<b>examinations</b> 73:20	51:23 53:3,18	<b>fine</b> 9:15 70:14
<b>enter</b> 75:9 78:9,14	<b>example</b> 43:24	<b>fail</b> 54:1	71:13
78:17,17,18 84:23	92:11	<b>failed</b> 12:9 60:16	<b>finish</b> 30:4
<b>entered</b> 24:21 31:2	<b>exams</b> 23:10	<b>failure</b> 53:8,10	<b>firm</b> 69:17 80:11
32:24 88:4	<b>exception</b> 7:10 14:8	<b>fair</b> 28:14	<b>first</b> 6:13 10:6
<b>entertain</b> 9:22 73:4	52:8,12	<b>faith</b> 13:11 50:3	16:20 24:9 43:7
<b>entertaining</b> 22:21	<b>exceptions</b> 25:12	<b>familiar</b> 42:6 66:12	44:1 51:13 56:10,13
<b>entire</b> 12:8 26:7	<b>excess</b> 12:5	<b>family</b> 21:10	67:8 77:7 80:1
30:23 37:14	<b>exhibit</b> 52:7	<b>far</b> 43:2 45:6	83:25
<b>entirely</b> 31:6 37:24	<b>exists</b> 26:18 40:8	<b>fast</b> 43:19	<b>five</b> 78:20,21 79:10
48:5	<b>expansive</b> 39:2	<b>fatal</b> 53:7	<b>fixed</b> 61:23

[focusing - honor]

Page 8

<b>focusing</b> 26:23	<b>g</b>	87:24 88:5,5,9	87:22 89:16,20 93:1
<b>follow</b> 34:21 50:2	<b>g</b> 6:1 59:7	89:12 90:17,18,23	<b>he'll</b> 72:23
53:21 76:13	<b>gas</b> 43:2	<b>gonna</b> 44:21 48:22	<b>hear</b> 24:6,23 39:6
<b>followed</b> 24:17 91:6	<b>general</b> 56:10 60:12	<b>good</b> 6:2,14 13:11	40:16 42:12 76:7
<b>following</b> 9:9 12:11	60:17 62:3 83:16,18	34:3 50:3 56:14,15	<b>heard</b> 9:19 30:3
<b>footnote</b> 67:18	<b>generally</b> 58:18	71:14 74:8 76:9	35:23 41:8 81:19
<b>force</b> 29:22	77:3	<b>gotten</b> 27:9	<b>hearing</b> 3:1,4,7,10
<b>forced</b> 14:22 16:6	<b>generated</b> 51:1	<b>government</b> 58:14	3:13 8:9 23:8 51:17
<b>foregoing</b> 95:3	<b>germane</b> 43:23	<b>grant</b> 8:20 69:13,14	52:25 54:10 56:21
<b>forget</b> 80:10	<b>getting</b> 14:25 20:4	69:18 72:9,11,12,15	<b>heightened</b> 45:20
<b>forgo</b> 50:22	30:16 34:11 46:14	72:19 78:4 85:1	<b>held</b> 24:18 47:11
<b>formal</b> 56:17	<b>gibbons</b> 43:25	<b>granted</b> 16:10 19:6	51:10 69:25 85:16
<b>forth</b> 57:12 78:20	<b>give</b> 10:15 15:7 41:4	28:20 58:14 68:12	<b>helen</b> 4:10 9:18
<b>forward</b> 23:18	41:7,20 45:21 46:17	68:14,16,20 71:2	22:10 52:6
29:20 44:16 46:14	47:15 77:8 85:21	<b>granting</b> 29:17	<b>helene</b> 4:4 26:2
66:22 67:12,14	87:5	68:16 69:22 74:25	60:24
81:19 83:21	<b>given</b> 24:19 29:23	<b>green</b> 2:13	<b>help</b> 38:25
<b>found</b> 23:24	41:21 55:12 60:13	<b>greenberg</b> 47:16,17	<b>helpful</b> 14:25 23:25
<b>foundation</b> 82:13	77:13	<b>greenberg's</b> 47:18	<b>hereinafter</b> 49:20
<b>four</b> 21:23 52:11,17	<b>gives</b> 18:15 43:19	<b>greenblatt</b> 85:4	<b>highly</b> 31:19,20
55:23 69:6	85:25 92:18	<b>gregory</b> 4:9 6:14	45:16
<b>fourth</b> 77:13	<b>glickman</b> 5:6 71:6,8	<b>grind</b> 88:12	<b>history</b> 8:19
<b>frame</b> 17:12 27:20	71:8,15,18,21 72:1	<b>groundless</b> 40:22	<b>hold</b> 7:21 8:10,25
32:16 49:8 71:18	72:17,18,21	49:15	9:5 17:4 30:17 62:9
<b>frankly</b> 20:8 24:1	<b>glitnir</b> 59:7	<b>grounds</b> 18:8,10	66:14 67:5 70:16
40:19 75:15	<b>go</b> 6:23 7:14 14:4	57:12,22 59:2	87:15
<b>fraud</b> 48:1	24:1 26:19 28:19	<b>group</b> 57:23	<b>holding</b> 15:4 62:22
<b>fraudster</b> 44:2	31:15 39:8 40:19	<b>guess</b> 6:16 14:9,12	<b>holds</b> 42:3
<b>fraudulent</b> 60:15	41:2 44:10,16 48:20	14:14 28:5 34:22	<b>hon</b> 2:24
90:25 91:18,20	65:17 66:22 77:6	66:8 69:15 83:2,22	<b>honestly</b> 12:19
92:14,20	81:19,20,20 83:13	85:7,20 92:1	<b>honor</b> 6:3,14,24
<b>frd</b> 59:5 62:1	83:14,21,22	<b>h</b>	7:13 9:18 11:11
<b>free</b> 34:22 51:16	<b>goes</b> 22:13 23:6	<b>h</b> 1:13 2:4 4:13 5:18	12:18 13:3 14:15
54:14 62:24	46:4 65:9 91:21,22	<b>halpern</b> 19:10	19:6,10,16 21:2,10
<b>frustration</b> 33:13	92:21	35:13,14,16 63:15	22:2,12,13,18,21
<b>full</b> 86:5	<b>going</b> 8:25 13:5	64:2,3 69:21	23:4,24 24:8,16,25
<b>fund</b> 58:22	15:7,8,17,23,24,25	<b>halpern's</b> 64:5	26:16 28:7,12,16
<b>funds</b> 58:20 61:23	16:8,15,17,20 17:7	<b>hand</b> 41:1	30:1,23 35:23 36:17
<b>further</b> 18:4 25:11	17:11,16 23:18 24:3	<b>happen</b> 46:9	40:18 41:2,6,25
31:16 34:12 48:22	25:3 26:21 27:11	<b>happened</b> 33:8 44:4	42:8,21 44:16 45:24
51:15 56:5,11 85:16	29:8,12 30:13,17,20	73:9	46:3,16 47:7 48:19
<b>furthermore</b> 52:16	35:4 40:21 41:17	<b>happens</b> 27:7 75:25	49:12 65:6,19 67:6
55:4 59:23 61:17	42:8 44:9 46:14	<b>happy</b> 38:24 89:17	67:18 68:4 69:8,12
<b>futile</b> 78:12	65:23 66:4,7 67:1,2	<b>harris</b> 5:13 78:22	69:19 70:3,13,20
<b>future</b> 28:5	67:9,12,14,15 71:19	79:3,5,8,12,15 80:5	71:6,13 72:4,6,16
	71:24 73:24 74:25	81:5,11 85:23 86:2	72:22 73:6,18 74:24
	81:13 82:18 84:25	86:10,15,19,25	76:9,11 78:4 80:12



[honor - kwon]

Page 9

81:2,5,18 82:14 83:1 84:22 85:13 86:10 87:20 89:5,6 89:17,23 91:9,21 92:25 93:3 <b>honor's</b> 42:6 43:13 73:12 <b>hostetler</b> 4:12 <b>hundreds</b> 17:3 22:16,19 <b>hurry</b> 88:2 <b>husband</b> 43:24 44:2 <b>hyde</b> 3:25 95:3,8 <b>hypothetical</b> 35:2 75:3	<b>industry</b> 83:19 <b>inform</b> 68:4 <b>information</b> 10:15 10:21 14:25 15:25 17:11,19,19 18:20 19:3,19,25 20:21 23:5 33:21 37:22,24 37:25 38:8,11,18 45:2 50:9 57:7,8 58:3 59:7,11,12,19 59:20,24 60:9,18,19 74:3,9,13 75:5,11 75:12 85:1 90:3 92:13 <b>initial</b> 21:3 42:2 43:3,7,18 52:13 <b>initials</b> 43:19 <b>innocent</b> 48:5 <b>inquiries</b> 79:11 <b>insist</b> 53:1 <b>insisted</b> 52:20 56:25 <b>insistence</b> 54:7 <b>insisting</b> 22:5 55:15 <b>instance</b> 16:20 22:20 41:4 85:10 <b>instances</b> 22:17 67:19 <b>instant</b> 51:13 <b>insufficient</b> 9:8 <b>intend</b> 23:4 58:23 <b>intended</b> 43:16 55:2 55:4 62:21 <b>intent</b> 75:10 <b>intention</b> 24:1 76:14,19 <b>intentionally</b> 34:1 <b>interest</b> 21:5 25:9 40:21 59:6,13 85:20 <b>interesting</b> 27:14 28:1 <b>interests</b> 17:2 <b>interfere</b> 86:4 <b>interjected</b> 75:19 <b>interrupt</b> 25:21 <b>intrusion</b> 38:9 59:13	<b>investment</b> 1:8,14 2:5 4:14 <b>investments</b> 61:23 <b>investor</b> 1:5 <b>investors</b> 48:5 <b>invited</b> 80:21 <b>involved</b> 36:1 80:11 84:3 <b>iron</b> 78:8,9 <b>irrelevant</b> 17:19 31:20 37:24 57:8 58:2,3 75:15,16 <b>irving</b> 1:13 2:4 4:13 <b>issue</b> 9:19 10:10 11:12,18 12:12,12 13:12 14:2,6 15:5 17:13 18:13,14 19:9 23:22 26:17,22,23 28:7,13 31:21 32:10 38:20 42:19 43:6 44:13,23 45:14,22 46:10,10,11,12 47:4 47:5,8,19 48:10,11 48:12,14,23 50:20 58:5 63:3,6,14 69:5 73:17 74:17,18 76:11 77:24 80:3,11 83:15 85:5 86:5,7 90:21,21 91:4 92:1 92:16 <b>issued</b> 35:20 57:22 <b>issues</b> 16:4,5 22:15 45:13 48:11,23 49:2 51:14 56:10 68:18 82:4 86:11,12,18 <b>it'll</b> 17:6 73:2	72:4 <b>jim</b> 25:15 <b>job</b> 46:15 <b>john</b> 61:25 <b>joint</b> 25:16,25 26:14 26:14 27:4,8 61:2,6 <b>judge</b> 2:25 25:2 43:6 72:3 76:16 <b>judging</b> 58:8 <b>judgment</b> 24:2 <b>june</b> 70:1 <b>jury</b> 42:21,23 <b>justify</b> 54:9	
<b>i</b>	<b>identified</b> 53:14 79:15 <b>identify</b> 54:1 <b>implies</b> 58:23 <b>importance</b> 60:14 <b>impose</b> 53:8 <b>impression</b> 68:11 <b>improper</b> 77:12 <b>inclined</b> 78:4 <b>included</b> 90:2 <b>including</b> 61:4 <b>income</b> 61:23 <b>inconsistent</b> 54:18 <b>incorrect</b> 7:8 <b>incumbent</b> 54:15 <b>indicated</b> 10:19 <b>indiscernible</b> 7:7 10:5 11:14 13:7 18:1 23:19,24 34:16 41:11 42:5 44:5,14 49:16 53:12 57:6,7 58:7 70:18 72:14 73:14 78:13 83:8 88:21 92:15 <b>individual</b> 20:13 59:6 74:9 <b>individual's</b> 59:11 59:13 <b>individually</b> 7:9 21:4	<b>initial</b> 21:3 42:2 43:3,7,18 52:13 <b>initials</b> 43:19 <b>innocent</b> 48:5 <b>inquiries</b> 79:11 <b>insist</b> 53:1 <b>insisted</b> 52:20 56:25 <b>insistence</b> 54:7 <b>insisting</b> 22:5 55:15 <b>instance</b> 16:20 22:20 41:4 85:10 <b>instances</b> 22:17 67:19 <b>instant</b> 51:13 <b>insufficient</b> 9:8 <b>intend</b> 23:4 58:23 <b>intended</b> 43:16 55:2 55:4 62:21 <b>intent</b> 75:10 <b>intention</b> 24:1 76:14,19 <b>intentionally</b> 34:1 <b>interest</b> 21:5 25:9 40:21 59:6,13 85:20 <b>interesting</b> 27:14 28:1 <b>interests</b> 17:2 <b>interfere</b> 86:4 <b>interjected</b> 75:19 <b>interrupt</b> 25:21 <b>intrusion</b> 38:9 59:13	<b>j</b> <b>j</b> 4:19,20 5:6 <b>jail</b> 75:14 <b>james</b> 60:23 61:6 <b>january</b> 24:14 30:24 41:4 50:14 57:24 <b>jenson</b> 4:22 19:10 47:17 65:6,12,14,19 66:9,20,24 67:3 68:7,9 70:23 71:2,5	<b>k</b> <b>karin</b> 4:22 <b>keep</b> 48:9,9 81:3 <b>keeps</b> 44:11 <b>kevin</b> 5:18 <b>kind</b> 14:11 <b>kinds</b> 46:3 <b>kirby</b> 80:13,15,22 89:22 <b>knew</b> 48:1 82:12,13 <b>know</b> 7:13 15:1,13 15:25 16:19 18:2,10 19:1,2,4 20:7,22 21:11 35:24 38:12 43:12 44:4 45:19,25 48:9,22 63:19 64:25 65:9 67:11,21 68:6 68:8 72:21 74:6,16 76:3 77:24 82:6,12 83:6,6,8,9 84:20 85:10 86:23 87:16 89:24 92:3 <b>knowledge</b> 36:5 81:23 82:3 83:24 84:2 <b>knowledgeable</b> 36:6 84:8,19 <b>known</b> 48:7,7 <b>knows</b> 13:8 23:8 42:23 83:9 <b>krause</b> 5:1 <b>kwon</b> 5:14

[l - motors]

Page 10

<b>l</b>	<b>liabilities</b> 61:5	<b>m</b>	<b>mention</b> 52:12
<b>l</b> 1:8,13 2:4 3:5 4:14	<b>liability</b> 58:20	<b>m</b> 2:24 4:9	82:16
59:7	<b>light</b> 39:14	<b>madoff</b> 1:8,14 2:5	<b>mentioned</b> 52:17
<b>laboring</b> 87:10	<b>limit</b> 75:8	3:5 4:14 6:2,5,12	54:3 55:22 64:16
<b>lack</b> 57:25 58:24	<b>limitation</b> 90:22	25:8 37:9,13 48:1	<b>mentioning</b> 47:3
<b>lacked</b> 36:5	<b>limitations</b> 78:6,10	61:4,10,19 70:22	<b>michael</b> 5:14
<b>lacks</b> 57:21	81:1 87:5 88:9,16	73:14,16 74:2,6,7	<b>mind</b> 25:3 33:10
<b>laid</b> 73:19	90:5	74:12,23 75:24 77:8	34:1 67:4 81:4 90:5
<b>langford</b> 57:19	<b>limited</b> 37:12 74:17	78:5 82:11,17 84:13	<b>mineola</b> 95:23
<b>language</b> 33:14	76:12	84:14,20 90:5 92:4	<b>minor</b> 10:19 11:1
76:24 77:1,2,4	<b>limiting</b> 75:9 76:23	92:10	<b>minute</b> 12:4,4 17:15
<b>large</b> 60:21 85:6	76:24 77:3 81:6,7	<b>madoff's</b> 81:22	20:17 30:3 32:10
<b>late</b> 70:8 83:3	84:23 85:15 88:4	<b>maintain</b> 69:10	<b>misrepresenting</b>
<b>latitude</b> 92:19	<b>limits</b> 78:5	<b>man</b> 63:19 70:11	51:8
<b>law</b> 14:10 18:7,11	<b>line</b> 44:8 77:21,23	<b>march</b> 2:16 11:9,23	<b>modified</b> 58:16
20:9 41:24 43:1	94:4	32:12 37:6 95:25	<b>modifies</b> 40:2
49:5 58:21 63:12	<b>liquidation</b> 1:13 2:4	<b>marcy</b> 5:13	<b>modify</b> 39:24 57:12
80:11 92:18	4:14	<b>mark</b> 46:2 71:11	57:13
<b>lawrence</b> 1:17 4:4	<b>listed</b> 34:8	<b>marked</b> 79:18	<b>money</b> 12:21 13:20
9:4,24 11:1 14:8	<b>listen</b> 9:21	<b>match</b> 65:24	14:2,4,11 25:25
25:6,12,15,22 26:24	<b>listening</b> 22:3 34:17	<b>matter</b> 6:16 19:14	26:4,11,20,21 39:17
28:18 39:8 40:2	<b>literally</b> 22:16	19:25 22:18 30:1	63:11,13 64:16 65:2
52:3,12 54:3,22	<b>litigation</b> 17:5	38:18 57:15 58:21	67:15 82:19 83:8,25
55:13 56:3 58:19	30:14 32:7 42:17	73:5,7,8,15 74:20	<b>months</b> 22:13,22
60:23,24 61:2,3,6	51:2 61:23 70:1	75:13,20 77:16,16	30:24 31:8 40:6
62:14 63:10 69:21	86:5 90:25 91:19	82:16 86:17 92:13	72:1
<b>lawrence's</b> 60:25	92:14	<b>matters</b> 9:23 70:19	<b>moot</b> 32:15
62:16	<b>little</b> 79:10 89:11	75:6	<b>morning</b> 6:2,4,14
<b>lawyer</b> 6:11	<b>live</b> 45:20	<b>mckenzie</b> 80:14	23:25 76:9
<b>lawyers</b> 29:13	<b>llc</b> 1:8,14 2:5 4:15	<b>mcwane</b> 59:16,19	<b>motion</b> 3:1,4,10,13
<b>leading</b> 30:25	57:23 62:1	<b>mean</b> 7:2 15:14	6:11,16,17,18,20,21
<b>learned</b> 65:20	<b>llp</b> 3:13 4:3,12 5:1,8	16:25 24:25 31:12	6:21,22 7:16,17,17
<b>leave</b> 40:24 72:9,11	6:15 49:20	31:18 34:22 35:5	7:19 8:3,14,17,22
72:12 75:1 78:4	<b>loaded</b> 13:5	38:3 40:1,7 47:14	17:16,21 19:5 30:25
<b>leaves</b> 37:4	<b>long</b> 71:19 92:12	91:2,9	40:19 44:14 49:14
<b>ledanski</b> 3:25 95:3	<b>longer</b> 22:9,23	<b>meaningful</b> 9:1	57:3 61:7 68:12,14
95:8	58:12	34:2	69:14,18 70:24 72:9
<b>legal</b> 14:2 95:20	<b>look</b> 7:4 8:23,24	<b>meaningless</b> 23:25	72:21 73:16,19 76:1
<b>legitimately</b> 27:10	12:24 16:2 34:14	<b>means</b> 15:14 42:14	84:9 85:1 87:1 89:4
<b>letter</b> 8:22 21:23,24	38:3,4 44:1,9 45:17	<b>meant</b> 74:7	<b>motions</b> 6:10,17
32:7 51:1 52:3 57:1	45:18 47:12 77:3	<b>mediator</b> 16:23,24	22:21 32:7 48:23,24
82:19	78:19 83:5 84:25	<b>meet</b> 51:13 55:6	50:2 53:6 55:16
<b>letters</b> 8:15 53:25	<b>looked</b> 21:19	56:16,19 60:10	56:1,7,11,13,17
54:24 56:24 57:1	<b>looking</b> 11:18 37:1	<b>members</b> 21:10	57:2 69:22,23 70:5
<b>letting</b> 43:14	79:4 89:25	<b>memorialized</b> 8:8	70:15 71:3 94:6
<b>level</b> 47:24	<b>lot</b> 8:17 30:5 40:20	55:5	<b>motors</b> 57:19
	74:1 80:7 85:19		

[movant - passed]

Page 11

<b>movant</b> 46:21 <b>move</b> 24:1 25:17 29:20,21 44:12 45:12 51:5,18 54:15 <b>moved</b> 49:21 52:21 56:2,3 <b>moving</b> 46:21 56:15	<b>nova</b> 57:23 <b>number</b> 11:19,22 11:22,25 12:5,15,16 25:5,5 35:17,19 36:18 44:3 63:23,25 89:2,4 <b>numerous</b> 38:7 <b>ny</b> 2:14 4:7,17 5:4 5:11 95:23	89:19 92:2 <b>old</b> 95:21 <b>omnibus</b> 42:13 <b>once</b> 17:10 27:23 <b>ones</b> 78:23 79:13 88:12 <b>open</b> 28:25 57:14 57:16 58:19 59:10 <b>opened</b> 65:10 <b>operating</b> 46:5 <b>opportunity</b> 7:22 8:1,11 9:1 19:17,22 24:19 28:12 29:23 31:4 41:7 43:19 53:3 79:17 85:21 87:6 88:6,14,18,24 <b>opposed</b> 23:22 <b>opposition</b> 85:15 <b>oral</b> 9:22 <b>orally</b> 24:22 <b>order</b> 3:2,8 6:5,17 8:4,6,7,16 17:5 24:21,24 25:4 27:4 31:2 32:13,23 33:5 33:9,12 40:3 41:6 42:17 43:4 45:1,24 46:5,7 51:17 52:5 52:25 53:9,11,14 54:8,13,16 55:2,5 55:10,17,17 56:3,12 56:23 60:23 61:7 69:15,17,23 70:1 71:10,12 72:20,23 73:2,3,12 75:9 76:18,23 78:9,15,17 78:17,18 81:6,7,10 84:23 87:4,24 89:7 89:14,18 92:24 <b>order's</b> 89:10 <b>ordered</b> 25:2 46:4 <b>orders</b> 14:4 45:16 88:4 <b>ought</b> 78:24 <b>outflows</b> 15:2 <b>outlined</b> 84:24 <b>outstanding</b> 32:14 32:18,19,20	<b>outweigh</b> 60:18 <b>outweighs</b> 62:3 <b>overblown</b> 75:15 <b>overlapped</b> 6:22 <b>overstates</b> 45:22 <b>owner</b> 26:14 <b>owners</b> 61:2
<b>n</b>	<b>ny</b> 2:14 4:7,17 5:4 5:11 95:23	<b>p</b>	
<b>n</b> 4:1 6:1 59:7 94:1 95:1 <b>name</b> 24:6 <b>names</b> 41:10 <b>national</b> 5:2 6:19 10:21,25 25:7,11,14 61:1 70:24 71:9 <b>national's</b> 61:17 <b>nauseam</b> 49:8 <b>necessarily</b> 76:1 84:18 <b>necessary</b> 51:14,18 <b>need</b> 23:5,9 29:15 44:16 46:11 48:17 48:18 65:3 66:22 69:2 77:1 <b>needed</b> 28:25 <b>needs</b> 20:20 87:9 <b>negotiate</b> 9:12 <b>neither</b> 79:21 <b>neutral</b> 16:22,24 62:7 <b>never</b> 12:14 14:16 21:11 22:25 41:9 43:20 74:4,4 89:10 <b>nevertheless</b> 54:17 <b>new</b> 1:2 2:14 4:7,17 5:4,11 20:6 21:9 29:12,13 45:15 67:20,20,24 68:5,22 <b>non</b> 57:18,22 <b>north</b> 81:15 90:18 <b>note</b> 62:25 <b>noted</b> 63:15 <b>notice</b> 69:10 87:4 <b>noticed</b> 49:13 <b>notwithstanding</b> 90:1	<b>o</b> <b>o</b> 2:23 6:1 95:1 <b>o'neal</b> 43:25 <b>object</b> 17:17,22 18:8,19 26:24 30:22 54:12 57:17 59:1 88:13,14,16 <b>objection</b> 31:1,22 37:11 47:6 67:17 69:4 76:22,24 77:17 78:12,19 80:20 86:22 <b>objections</b> 41:22 77:2 <b>obligations</b> 92:18 <b>obtain</b> 37:13 38:6 <b>obtained</b> 19:18 <b>obvious</b> 84:14 <b>obviously</b> 29:2,25 63:6 66:24 <b>occurred</b> 50:17 73:22 85:6,11 <b>office</b> 41:11 <b>officer</b> 46:6 <b>offset</b> 61:5 <b>oh</b> 20:17 36:25 43:17 64:23 70:21 73:1,13 80:10 86:14 <b>okay</b> 11:3 13:10,19 24:5 31:13 32:4 34:5 35:16 38:1 42:7 44:7,18,24 64:23 67:1,25 69:9 69:15 70:14 71:14 72:18 73:13 74:11 76:2 79:4 81:11,17 83:4 84:22 85:18 87:18,21 88:23 89:9	<b>p</b> 4:1,1 6:1 <b>page</b> 79:5 94:4 <b>pages</b> 89:3 <b>paid</b> 39:11 46:12 58:8,10 <b>papers</b> 41:22 88:25 <b>paragraph</b> 61:8 74:21 90:3 <b>paranoia</b> 90:1 <b>pardon</b> 72:25 <b>park</b> 4:6 <b>part</b> 7:16 57:13 58:14 81:6 <b>parte</b> 27:24 <b>participate</b> 80:18 89:22 <b>participating</b> 80:23 <b>particular</b> 22:20 47:19 74:22 <b>particularly</b> 12:23 80:2 <b>parties</b> 5:9 30:24 31:7 51:13 55:5 56:15 57:22 59:3 75:7 76:15,21 77:8 77:10,15 78:21,23 78:25 79:8,22,22,23 80:2,3,9 85:21 88:10 89:7 90:1,9 90:11 <b>party</b> 3:11 12:10 14:11,18 17:7,18 18:8 24:11 45:9 47:22 53:8 57:16,18 57:21 58:22 59:2 62:5,7 <b>party's</b> 18:7 <b>passed</b> 19:22	

[pay - prove]

Page 12

<b>pay</b> 12:21 14:2,10 39:18	<b>place</b> 44:1 71:11	<b>previously</b> 52:1,9	90:10 91:7 93:4
<b>payment</b> 15:3	<b>plainly</b> 59:20	<b>principal</b> 11:15,17	95:4
<b>payments</b> 39:20	<b>plaintiff</b> 1:6,15 2:6	12:6,8	<b>process</b> 29:1 32:5
58:15 84:5,17	<b>plausible</b> 42:5,9	<b>principle</b> 20:9 49:4	<b>produce</b> 10:22,25
<b>pending</b> 19:24 20:3	<b>playing</b> 41:20	49:6 91:1,8	15:24 16:8,14 17:10
28:4 55:11,15 73:8	<b>plaza</b> 4:16	<b>prior</b> 40:8 56:9	33:19 38:13,25
87:13	<b>pleading</b> 46:24,25	<b>prison</b> 82:12 84:11	65:16 66:6 70:24
<b>penitentiary</b> 81:16	<b>pleadings</b> 89:3	90:8	71:20
<b>people</b> 17:2 26:19	<b>please</b> 6:2 9:9 12:15	<b>privacy</b> 18:14 32:10	<b>produced</b> 10:21,25
47:25 48:4 74:5	12:16 89:2	44:11 45:12,14	15:16 25:7,10 30:15
84:10	<b>pm</b> 93:5	46:10,10,11,12 47:3	39:13 53:24 67:2
<b>percent</b> 16:16	<b>point</b> 9:6,7 15:20	47:5,8,24 48:10,12	69:25 71:11
<b>period</b> 12:11 20:19	18:4 23:9,21 24:4	59:2,6,9,13 60:13	<b>production</b> 59:10
22:22 33:17 35:19	28:7 30:1 32:21	60:17 62:3,12	61:17,21 65:25
36:8 37:9 50:10	45:1 48:19,21 66:16	<b>privilege</b> 57:16	<b>profit</b> 73:17 74:17
57:15,18 58:13	77:9,10 90:15,17	<b>privileged</b> 57:15	77:14 80:11,23
59:14 65:3,11,23	<b>ponzi</b> 26:19	61:25	81:23 82:16,23 83:6
70:6 85:17,20 86:12	<b>popping</b> 44:11	<b>privy</b> 86:25	85:3 86:7 90:22
<b>periods</b> 85:7	<b>portion</b> 58:22 59:15	<b>probably</b> 38:20	91:3
<b>permissible</b> 27:12	<b>posed</b> 77:12	74:13	<b>profits</b> 50:4,6 58:8
61:25	<b>position</b> 7:1 22:8	<b>problem</b> 11:14 17:8	58:15 63:7 65:18
<b>permit</b> 27:1	<b>possible</b> 7:10 16:11	37:10 68:16 69:8	91:8
<b>permitted</b> 32:11	<b>power</b> 24:25	85:8	<b>progress</b> 86:5
81:22 82:5	<b>practical</b> 38:20	<b>problems</b> 66:11	<b>prohibition</b> 27:18
<b>person</b> 15:2,9	75:13 90:7	67:11	27:19 51:12 54:5
<b>personal</b> 16:15	<b>practice</b> 30:25	<b>procedural</b> 8:19	<b>prohibitions</b> 27:15
17:23 18:6 27:6	53:13	20:1 32:15	<b>promise</b> 17:8
31:19 33:21 35:10	<b>practices</b> 83:17,19	<b>procedure</b> 8:5	<b>propose</b> 65:19
48:6 59:6,11,18	<b>precise</b> 36:8	14:16 27:13 31:10	68:21 76:25 78:4
81:23 82:3	<b>precisely</b> 27:25	34:21 52:23 57:11	81:12 88:18
<b>personally</b> 40:23	<b>predicated</b> 8:3,14	91:6	<b>proposed</b> 50:1,19
91:17	8:17	<b>procedures</b> 9:10	51:22 53:17 78:3,7
<b>perspective</b> 23:21	<b>preference</b> 6:3	24:17 91:5	87:4,24 88:4,10,11
<b>persuasion</b> 59:3	<b>preferred</b> 91:24	<b>proceed</b> 6:16 7:14	88:16,19
<b>perverted</b> 23:21	<b>preparing</b> 65:20	8:13 9:16 20:1,12	<b>proposing</b> 80:1
<b>phone</b> 27:5 68:10	<b>present</b> 5:16 10:1	30:20 33:7 72:8	<b>protect</b> 17:1 18:25
<b>phraseology</b> 88:13	75:7 80:10 90:10,14	74:25	61:25
<b>picard</b> 1:13 2:4	<b>press</b> 41:19	<b>proceeded</b> 7:25 8:2	<b>protected</b> 57:15
4:13	<b>pressure</b> 29:25	<b>proceeding</b> 19:19	<b>protection</b> 1:5 17:5
<b>picower</b> 5:9 74:18	<b>presumably</b> 59:22	19:24 20:3,3 27:24	<b>protective</b> 3:2 6:17
74:21 75:6,11 76:15	<b>presume</b> 80:17	28:4 31:3,5 42:19	45:16 46:5 51:17
76:21 77:8,10,15	<b>pretty</b> 79:1	50:21 76:18 77:15	52:5 54:13,16 55:2
78:21,23,25 79:1,6	<b>prevent</b> 74:22 75:4	80:24	55:16,17 56:3,12,23
79:11,16,23 80:3	<b>preventing</b> 31:2	<b>proceedings</b> 19:18	57:3 60:23 61:7
85:15 88:10 89:6	60:20	21:6 45:3 49:19,22	69:23 70:1 71:10
90:1,3	<b>previous</b> 31:7	50:5 51:9 52:18	<b>prove</b> 10:8 13:13
		53:3 54:10 90:7,9	15:15 60:3,8,9

[prove - relevant]

Page 13

61:13 62:19 90:23 <b>proved</b> 90:23 <b>provide</b> 8:11 9:1 34:2 69:11 77:5 <b>provided</b> 31:4 33:16 34:25 69:9 86:16 <b>providing</b> 7:22 <b>proving</b> 10:8 <b>provisions</b> 85:15 <b>public</b> 85:19 <b>purpose</b> 26:25 32:6 35:3 61:15 62:20 86:21 91:16 <b>purposes</b> 56:19 70:15 <b>pursuant</b> 17:5 28:10 52:21 56:7 69:25 <b>pursue</b> 23:11 <b>put</b> 12:11,12 14:12 15:23 25:25 31:1 58:4 62:18 63:3 72:20 74:20 75:16 88:13 <b>puts</b> 13:6 63:13 <b>putting</b> 32:10 42:16 <b>pw</b> 92:8	<b>questioned</b> 36:11 <b>questions</b> 9:2 17:17 35:3 76:14,19 77:12 80:6 <b>quite</b> 12:19,22 18:11 20:7 24:1 26:18 40:19 46:3 75:15 <b>quote</b> 57:14,15,16 57:18 58:19,22 59:10,14	<b>recall</b> 9:13 35:21 <b>recalls</b> 22:12 <b>recanted</b> 33:25 <b>receipt</b> 11:7 13:14 37:2,3 39:17 63:2 63:13,24,25 64:14 64:17 65:2 <b>receipts</b> 64:13,20 <b>receive</b> 12:21 13:20 14:2,4,11 22:25 26:19 63:4 <b>received</b> 10:16 11:21,24 12:14 13:23 15:5 26:11 54:21 65:4,5 68:10 85:24 <b>receiving</b> 64:16 <b>recipient</b> 58:20 <b>recognized</b> 59:5 <b>recollection</b> 36:21 <b>recompute</b> 91:1 <b>reconstruct</b> 85:5 <b>record</b> 14:19 18:23 24:17 31:1 39:11 40:8 51:11,15 71:20 83:7 95:4 <b>record's</b> 70:23 <b>records</b> 6:25 7:4 10:3,7,9,12,12,13 10:14,18,24 11:6 12:12 13:22 15:7 16:16 17:10,23 18:6 18:11 23:2,6,8 25:11,16 26:25 27:3 27:4,7,7,10 31:19 32:11 33:19 35:10 37:5,6,8,14,19 38:7 39:1,1,10,12,12,13 42:24 43:15,20 46:15 47:10,18 48:6 50:23 58:1,2 59:24 60:1,2,4,6,12,13,14 60:25 61:1,12,14,18 62:3,6,7,10,17,19 64:21 65:4,8,23,24 65:25 66:6,7,17,18 66:22,23 67:2 69:10	70:16 73:11 83:11 85:3,7,12 91:18 <b>recover</b> 50:5 59:21 63:8 91:7 <b>redact</b> 46:2 <b>redacted</b> 47:10,20 61:18 62:5 <b>redaction</b> 62:10,11 85:21 86:13,16 87:8 87:13,14 <b>redactions</b> 61:21 77:11 <b>reducing</b> 66:11 <b>referred</b> 52:3 <b>reflect</b> 42:24 <b>reflected</b> 7:11 13:21 <b>reflecting</b> 25:8 <b>refrain</b> 55:7,8 <b>refund</b> 39:19 <b>refunded</b> 58:14 <b>refunds</b> 12:23 39:18 61:4 <b>refusal</b> 54:9 60:6 <b>regard</b> 23:1,3,10 42:1 <b>regarding</b> 6:10 10:15 38:11 47:20 52:1 54:5 76:15 <b>reinvest</b> 82:22 <b>reiterated</b> 51:11 <b>related</b> 6:9 14:21 61:4,19 75:11 76:1 90:21 <b>relating</b> 50:9,20 52:18 53:4 61:4 74:21 75:5 <b>released</b> 34:20 <b>relevance</b> 18:9,10 25:19 59:12 60:18 62:2 90:6 <b>relevancy</b> 57:22 60:11 <b>relevant</b> 14:25 16:17 20:19 33:17 33:18,19 36:16 37:9 37:24 38:1,2,8,23 50:23 57:13 59:18
<b>q</b>	<b>r</b>		
<b>quality</b> 34:10 <b>quash</b> 3:1 25:18 46:21 54:16 55:16 56:1,2,3,11,13 57:3 57:5,12,13 58:1 59:3 69:22 <b>quashed</b> 6:17 59:16 <b>quashing</b> 53:22 <b>queried</b> 23:4 <b>question</b> 9:21,23 13:25 14:1,1,13 16:20 20:22 23:15 23:16 26:11,12,20 27:14 28:1 34:24 39:16 42:18 49:3,10 63:23 68:15 71:9 75:2,3 77:9 83:2	<b>r</b> 2:23 4:1,21 6:1 59:7 95:1 <b>raise</b> 14:16,17 16:6 44:14,22 48:12,13 49:2 51:14 62:11 83:15 90:20 <b>raised</b> 15:5 28:2,13 39:9 47:6 48:23,23 63:10 91:15 <b>raises</b> 14:1 16:4 27:13 <b>raising</b> 92:1 <b>rakoff</b> 43:6 <b>ramifications</b> 91:4 <b>reach</b> 91:11 <b>reaction</b> 46:1 <b>read</b> 11:13 14:1 85:3 88:25 <b>reader</b> 61:22 <b>realize</b> 82:15 <b>really</b> 6:18,20 13:8 29:25 33:9 38:5,6 45:23 46:20 71:25 74:7 77:18 80:3 83:2 88:12,15 92:15 <b>reason</b> 9:9 22:8,9 22:12 33:20,24 42:23,23 43:11 44:10 62:8,21 73:21 74:19,19 <b>reasonable</b> 92:15 <b>reasonably</b> 92:12 <b>reasons</b> 50:2 67:14 83:20		

[relevant - satisfied]

Page 14

<p>59:20 65:16,23 85:2  <b>reliance</b> 92:15  <b>relief</b> 58:14 76:17  76:20 77:7  <b>relies</b> 92:12  <b>relieve</b> 55:2,4  <b>rely</b> 8:4 23:1  <b>relying</b> 23:7  <b>remain</b> 86:17 87:12  <b>remedial</b> 56:19  <b>remedies</b> 35:6,8  <b>remedy</b> 16:11 40:2  40:14 53:11  <b>remember</b> 36:7,17  36:18 89:21  <b>renders</b> 26:14  <b>repeated</b> 49:7  <b>reply</b> 77:25 88:15  88:18 89:25  <b>reporting</b> 70:7  <b>reports</b> 85:4  <b>represent</b> 6:15  18:24 19:4  <b>representation</b> 8:9  23:16 24:9 31:10,25  41:5 53:16,20 54:19  55:3  <b>representations</b>  8:18 33:25 49:22  52:24 62:22  <b>representative</b>  49:20  <b>representatives</b>  21:9 29:13  <b>represented</b> 20:13  50:15 67:13  <b>representing</b> 7:21  29:2,4  <b>represents</b> 6:13  92:8  <b>request</b> 7:12,23  8:12 12:5 13:5 14:3  21:12 22:11,25 23:9  25:13 31:25 33:2,5  36:12 37:17 38:21  49:25 50:19 51:8  52:11,13 53:18</p>	<p>54:20 55:18,21,23  60:22 61:10,15  62:11 63:25 64:7  67:9,10 82:18 83:7  84:23 86:16 87:9  <b>requested</b> 37:16  55:10 83:25  <b>requests</b> 7:24 8:1  9:4 22:6,10,13,16  22:24 23:17 28:9  29:15,23 30:2,11  31:4,16 34:13,22  35:6 39:2 51:23  52:10,17 53:5 58:9  67:15 78:21 85:22  86:19 87:11,14,14  87:17,17  <b>require</b> 13:6 62:18  90:25  <b>required</b> 14:10,17  33:2 39:2 54:11  56:15 58:21 63:12  <b>requirement</b> 15:3  69:24  <b>requirements</b> 55:5  56:18,20 87:2  <b>requires</b> 10:8 32:24  57:14 61:13  <b>resolution</b> 29:8,21  55:11 68:18 87:13  <b>resolve</b> 11:1 22:15  68:3 78:16  <b>resolved</b> 10:20 55:9  70:19 73:10 78:18  86:11,18 87:17  <b>respect</b> 12:25 46:19  49:2 62:13,25 63:15  67:7 68:21 69:20  70:4,5 73:17 91:6  <b>respectfully</b> 23:13  23:23 90:4  <b>respective</b> 36:3  <b>respond</b> 32:2 33:6  49:13 52:9 54:23  55:21 86:24 87:6  88:8</p>	<p><b>responded</b> 55:18  <b>responding</b> 12:9  <b>responds</b> 14:7  <b>response</b> 25:12  39:14 53:4 63:24  65:16 79:2,8 89:25  <b>responses</b> 7:12 9:4  9:12 32:8 37:2  52:13,14 54:4,21  55:14 58:9 61:10  62:23 65:6  <b>ressler</b> 5:13 78:22  79:3,5,8,12,15 80:5  81:5,11 85:23 86:2  86:10,15,19,25  87:22 89:16,20 93:1  <b>restraining</b> 3:8  32:13  <b>restrictions</b> 87:5  <b>result</b> 51:10 81:7  <b>results</b> 85:6  <b>return</b> 64:1  <b>returned</b> 64:14  <b>reveal</b> 16:15 19:2  82:10  <b>revealed</b> 81:22  <b>reversed</b> 21:18  <b>review</b> 77:2 79:17  <b>richard</b> 4:20 80:14  <b>rid</b> 43:20  <b>right</b> 7:10 10:3,4,17  13:23 18:15,18  20:10,14,18 21:16  22:3 23:11 24:5,5  27:9 28:24 29:4,14  30:5,7 32:2,19,23  35:2,11,15 37:4,15  37:22,23 39:4 40:1  40:12 42:6,22 43:21  45:6 46:13,17 47:5  49:18 59:9 60:12  65:12 67:20 68:19  68:24 69:4,20 70:2  70:21 71:25 72:5  73:13,15 76:7 79:12  80:25 81:3 87:3,19  88:17 89:13,21</p>	<p>92:11,13,24  <b>rights</b> 20:1  <b>road</b> 95:21  <b>robert</b> 11:19,21,24  <b>rockefeller</b> 4:16  <b>roman</b> 11:4,21,25  55:14 69:21  <b>roman's</b> 11:19  <b>romans</b> 12:25 13:7  13:8 53:24 62:25  <b>roth</b> 2:8 3:14 5:8  6:11 28:19,19 29:1  29:18,19 52:2 55:18  67:8,9,19 68:5,6,9  68:10,21 69:6,14,18  70:5  <b>route</b> 33:25  <b>rule</b> 19:15,21,24  20:3 23:13,14 27:12  27:15,17,21 28:10  35:5,7,8,8 38:4  41:23 42:7 43:14,22  44:3 45:1,7 46:24  46:25 53:7,11 56:7  56:8 57:11  <b>ruled</b> 47:7 76:16  88:4,20,22  <b>rules</b> 8:4,5 14:15  27:13 38:4 52:22,22  53:9  <b>ruling</b> 8:7 28:5  32:12  <b>rulings</b> 94:3  <b>run</b> 76:18</p>
s			
<p>s 4:1,22 6:1  <b>sanctions</b> 53:8  55:12 81:8  <b>saren</b> 1:17 4:4 9:3  9:24 11:1 14:8  25:12 28:18 39:8  40:2 52:2,12 54:3  54:22 55:13 58:18  60:24 62:14,16  63:10 69:21  <b>satisfied</b> 18:23 35:7  46:24 65:24 66:3</p>			

[satisfied - status]

Page 15

<p>91:17 saw 84:9 saying 12:13,15 25:2 27:11 30:21 31:22 33:8 34:5,7 37:21 41:25 47:9 67:12 says 12:1,5,14 13:10 18:11 30:13,13 33:2 33:5 34:3 40:9 61:18 73:24 90:3 92:3,5,6 schedule 84:10 scheme 26:19 schulte 5:8 scope 75:9 77:3 78:6 88:19 90:16,19 sdny 57:24 59:5,8 61:24 62:1 seal 80:2 86:20 87:14 sealing 87:2 seanna 4:21 76:9 seated 6:2 sec 28:22 second 9:12 18:9 26:22 57:5,20 59:16 76:11 77:9 83:15 92:17 secondly 10:7 section 53:13 securities 1:5,8,14 2:5 4:15 see 11:18,22,25 12:15,16 16:10 20:17 21:23 36:21 36:25 37:1 52:6 61:20 63:23 64:9,12 66:16 68:23 69:6 78:25 86:22 92:23 seeing 80:23 seek 6:25 32:1,11 35:8 45:1 49:23 50:18 51:21 54:19 55:6 56:16,22 62:9 72:13 75:10</p>	<p>seeking 7:5 14:24 17:18 21:14 31:19 48:5 50:9 55:19 56:5 59:3,18,21 63:20 76:21 91:7 seeks 17:23 25:18 59:10 61:5 seen 17:6 self 81:9 send 35:9 72:23 82:19,22 83:7,25 sending 67:15 82:24 84:4,5 sense 46:10 47:2 77:25 sent 8:15 series 22:20 serve 22:11,12 31:18 33:2,5 34:21 34:23 50:16 67:9 served 9:5,13 21:12 21:23 22:4,6,15 23:17 30:10,10,11 31:24 38:22 39:3,5 41:12 49:25 50:8,19 51:8,9 52:2,9,11,13 52:14,16,19 53:17 54:4,20 55:14,22 service 22:23 serving 22:9 31:15 34:12 51:6 set 9:12 31:10 66:24 87:25 90:4 sets 57:11 78:20 settle 87:4 88:1 89:7 89:14,17 92:24 settled 73:7 settlement 87:23 seven 34:3 79:9 shapiro 20:22 21:1 21:3,23 22:4 28:18 28:21 29:12,12 30:8 31:24 32:13 52:2,11 52:18 55:23 67:7,10 67:11,20 68:8 69:3 69:6 70:5</p>	<p>shared 87:15 she'd 10:16 shed 39:14 sheehan 4:19 6:3,8 21:2,7,13,16,20 22:2,8 23:20 29:1,6 29:14,19 30:5 40:18 41:12 42:20 43:8,11 44:6,8,15,19,24 45:4,7,10 47:3 49:11,12,15,17 67:6 67:18,23 68:1,3,6,8 68:19,22,25 69:8,12 70:3,13,17,20 71:13 71:23 72:3,24 73:1 73:6,9 short 81:14,25 show 6:5 10:9 17:7 60:17 61:18 62:6,7 62:8 showing 17:8 shown 56:14 82:3 side 39:6 76:8 86:23 sides 91:10 signed 55:5 75:24 89:10 significant 12:13 85:4 similar 91:24 simple 40:14 simplest 40:10 simply 24:9 26:23 31:14 63:2 sipa 4:14 91:16,19 91:23 sir 71:7 sit 49:18 sitting 41:5 situation 25:6 six 71:25 72:1 smb 1:3,11 2:2 3:1 3:4,7,10,13 solely 37:12 solution 65:20 66:3 solutions 95:20 somebody 15:5 80:17 82:12,18,21</p>	<p>sons 61:25 sonya 3:25 95:3,8 sooner 56:15 sorry 22:2 35:20 48:19 63:22 68:7 70:23 73:1 74:24 sort 8:19 21:4 28:20 75:12 78:8 sought 21:24 39:12 59:12 77:7 source 74:3 southern 1:2 specific 20:10 36:5 56:9 62:10,13 77:4 79:10 specifically 13:14 25:6 74:18 77:2 83:11,23 spectrum 84:15 spirit 78:6 split 86:8 spoliation 50:16 spouse 60:23 staff 45:18 stand 9:14 32:22,24 62:19 standards 46:24,25 standing 17:17,22 18:4,5,8,12,15,19 25:16,17 26:24 44:13,22 48:12,13 49:4 57:17,21 58:1 59:1 standings 49:1 start 44:9 76:11 started 18:16 state 6:24 8:24 18:22 61:22 stated 51:15 54:10 63:4 65:22 statement 7:8 54:17 54:25 states 1:1 9:25 27:16 57:12 66:9 status 21:5,25 22:1 28:19 91:24</p>
--	--	--	--

[stay - thought]

Page 16

<p><b>stay</b> 3:8 54:5 72:13 72:15,19,20 73:3 <b>stayed</b> 55:10 <b>steps</b> 56:5 <b>stipulation</b> 50:19 51:23 53:18 <b>stipulations</b> 22:17 50:1 <b>stop</b> 15:19 41:18 <b>straight</b> 14:3 <b>street</b> 61:22 <b>strict</b> 22:14 56:17 <b>stuart</b> 2:24 <b>stuff</b> 46:2 <b>subject</b> 69:24 80:25 87:1 <b>submission</b> 65:21 66:10,13 <b>submit</b> 69:15,17 83:17 88:18 89:3 <b>submitted</b> 82:16 90:2 <b>subpoena</b> 3:2,11 14:19 17:18,23 18:8 21:25 24:18 25:18 26:25 31:22 32:20 34:4 35:9 37:8,11 38:24 39:12,14 40:4 41:7,12 46:22 50:22 51:4,6 52:4 53:17 53:22 54:6 56:4 57:12,14,17 59:10 59:15 60:25 66:5 68:21 69:2 <b>subpoenaed</b> 18:12 25:17 27:6,7 51:12 57:3 60:25 61:12 <b>subpoenas</b> 3:8 6:10 6:13,25 7:5,9,21 8:10 14:24 21:15 22:4,6 29:22 30:11 30:18 31:3,6,6,15 31:18,23 32:1 33:7 39:5 49:24 50:8,13 50:16,18 51:9,16,22 52:1,19 53:2,25 54:8,11,16,20 55:1</p>	<p>55:25 56:2,6,9,23 57:5,22 58:1 59:2,4 59:19 62:13,14,24 63:21 64:18,24 65:16 69:22 <b>subsequence</b> 23:3 42:1 <b>subsequent</b> 17:12 17:19 18:1,17,20,24 19:8,14 23:12 25:20 25:24 26:3,15,23 42:13,24 43:9,10 44:12 46:23 48:7,10 48:13 49:9 57:7,9 58:3,4 63:13 90:24 <b>subsequently</b> 58:25 <b>subsequents</b> 42:15 <b>substance</b> 13:4 <b>substantial</b> 7:11 <b>substantially</b> 7:6 <b>substantiate</b> 91:24 <b>substantive</b> 33:16 <b>substitute</b> 61:20 <b>sue</b> 43:9 <b>sued</b> 43:10 <b>suffer</b> 53:6 <b>sufficient</b> 35:1 56:6 <b>suggest</b> 41:25 <b>suggested</b> 62:15 <b>suggesting</b> 43:14 <b>suggestion</b> 41:1 62:4 <b>suggests</b> 43:1 <b>suit</b> 19:23 <b>suite</b> 95:22 <b>summary</b> 24:2 77:5 <b>support</b> 16:9 26:3 61:7 <b>supporting</b> 53:20 <b>suppose</b> 80:4,6 82:21 90:21 92:3 <b>supposed</b> 70:8 <b>supposedly</b> 53:15 85:11 <b>supreme</b> 27:16 <b>sure</b> 12:19,22 25:23 28:17 47:7 48:13</p>	<p>64:11 66:2 71:15 72:7 79:16,18,21 91:12 92:23 <b>suspicion</b> 61:21 <b>sustain</b> 60:16 <b>t</b> <b>t</b> 59:7 95:1,1 <b>tactics</b> 34:1 <b>take</b> 3:4 11:3 15:20 18:4 27:1,12,24 43:24 63:23 71:20 75:4 81:12,15 83:8 90:16 <b>taken</b> 88:2 <b>talk</b> 13:1 68:22 <b>talked</b> 28:17,18,18 <b>talking</b> 17:25,25 18:16,17 20:15 35:19 45:23 85:9 <b>tax</b> 39:10 58:15 61:4 <b>taxes</b> 12:21,24 14:3 39:11,18 58:8,10 <b>teed</b> 45:8,8 <b>telephone</b> 9:22 81:13 <b>telephonically</b> 4:10 5:16 <b>tell</b> 7:9,16,18 12:18 15:20 40:10 72:24 91:14 <b>telling</b> 20:2 23:18 66:18 <b>tells</b> 32:4 <b>temerity</b> 40:23 <b>temporary</b> 3:7 32:13 <b>ten</b> 71:21 85:9,11 <b>tend</b> 32:5 <b>term</b> 11:14 <b>terms</b> 13:7 47:3 87:25 <b>territory</b> 26:22 <b>testifies</b> 83:5 <b>testify</b> 83:16,24 <b>testimony</b> 75:9 77:8 77:13 83:10 90:6</p>	<p><b>thank</b> 24:8 40:16 46:16 49:18 52:19 67:3 71:5 72:3,4,16 72:22 87:20,22 92:25 93:1,2,3 <b>theory</b> 12:20 14:12 28:3 53:15 58:2 64:17 82:23 <b>theses</b> 31:18 <b>thing</b> 26:5 29:11 30:8 39:7 40:11 46:9 69:2 72:6 76:13 <b>things</b> 6:4,8 11:17 23:9,17 29:23 30:6 33:2 34:8 38:25 42:4 46:3 49:21 75:25 <b>think</b> 9:8,11 12:20 13:3,16,16 16:22 19:7 20:15,19 23:13 24:2,14,16 25:1 26:17,21 28:6,8 30:8 31:1,14,17 32:23 33:4 34:25 35:25 36:14,19 39:4 40:6,7,19,22 41:10 41:21 42:12,21 43:16,21 44:13,15 44:22 45:11,14,21 47:14,24 48:25 49:10,15 63:21 64:20 65:4 68:8 70:1 74:7,12 76:5,6 78:20,22 80:5,10 82:2,4,8 83:20 84:3 84:6 85:1,25 88:11 90:15 91:21,22 92:10,17,21 <b>third</b> 3:10 5:10 14:11 17:7,18 18:8 45:9 47:21 58:22 59:1,2 62:4,7 77:10 <b>thought</b> 18:23 63:17 64:19 74:5 89:15</p>
--	---	---	--



[thousands - waited]

Page 17

<p><b>thousands</b> 17:2  <b>three</b> 6:8,9 10:19  22:22 25:11 35:25  50:10 63:16 65:11  <b>time</b> 22:11 29:3,7  29:10,16,20 30:15  32:2 37:9 38:17  39:1 52:9 54:23  55:21 65:23 67:15  71:18 85:17,20  <b>timing</b> 56:18 57:2  68:17  <b>today</b> 22:9,25 28:13  29:9,21 30:2 40:18  44:22 45:9,21 68:13  68:17 73:2 77:24  84:24  <b>told</b> 12:23 21:20  44:1 51:5 64:20  67:8  <b>tossed</b> 40:21  <b>totally</b> 30:23 75:15  <b>trace</b> 26:4  <b>transaction</b> 91:13  91:19  <b>transactions</b> 16:17  81:24 82:25 84:17  <b>transcribed</b> 3:25  <b>transcript</b> 51:17  77:10,13 79:17,20  79:22 80:1,17 85:16  87:12 95:4  <b>transcripts</b> 24:20  <b>transfer</b> 17:19  18:17,20 43:3,7  57:7,9 58:3,21  60:15 63:12 90:24  90:25 91:20 92:14  92:20  <b>transferee</b> 19:8,14  25:20,25 26:4,15,23  42:2,25 43:9,10,18  44:13 46:23 48:7,10  48:14  <b>transferees</b> 18:24  21:3 23:12 49:9  50:3</p>	<p><b>transferred</b> 50:6  58:25  <b>transfers</b> 9:17,25  10:14 14:13,14  17:12 18:1 20:16,18  25:8 33:18,19 34:19  36:4,5,7 37:3,8,13  37:16 38:16 50:20  50:22 53:4 58:5  59:21,23 60:7,9,16  61:4,10,11,14,16,19  62:15,19,20,23 63:1  63:2,3,3,14,16,17  64:3 65:17  <b>treat</b> 28:9 60:19  <b>tri</b> 24:11  <b>trial</b> 15:20,23,24  <b>tro</b> 21:22  <b>true</b> 16:19 32:16  34:15 41:3 69:3  82:2 95:4  <b>trust</b> 36:2,5,7,17,23  61:22 64:16  <b>trustee</b> 1:13 2:4  4:13 6:18 7:1,24  8:2,10,25 9:7,11,14  9:15,16 10:8,11,18  12:9 13:6,8,13 14:7  14:7 15:20 16:10  17:4,8,11 19:13,16  19:17 20:16,20,25  24:13,22,23,24,25  26:17 27:1,5,6,9,10  27:11,20 28:3 30:11  31:2,9,15,17,23,24  32:4,9,22,24 33:2,5  33:8,20 34:3,6,11  34:12,20 35:7 36:2  36:2,3,4,4,6,14,16  36:23 37:7,23 38:6  38:10 39:3 40:16,21  44:19 46:4,15,24  47:10,15 48:5 49:23  49:25 50:4,8 51:2,7  51:16,25 52:4,16,24  53:15,21 54:14,23  55:3,12,15,20 56:4</p>	<p>56:19,22,25 59:17  59:21 60:3,7,8,19  60:24 61:13 62:8,10  62:18,23 65:21  73:20,25 76:10,20  85:5 88:11 89:7  91:5 92:3,12,19  <b>trustee's</b> 3:10 7:20  8:8 11:5 12:12  13:13,21 17:3,6  23:2 25:9 33:23  36:11 37:21 38:24  50:12,15,25 51:5,20  52:13 54:18 59:24  60:1,14 62:22 63:7  78:19 79:13 80:5  91:16 92:18  <b>trustees</b> 13:20 36:1  54:7 73:23  <b>trusts</b> 36:1,2,3  <b>turn</b> 51:5 78:24  <b>turned</b> 22:20 47:10  62:10 73:11  <b>turning</b> 56:9  <b>tv</b> 41:15  <b>two</b> 6:4 12:13 20:16  23:9 25:5 35:17,19  36:1,2,9,13,20 40:6  43:2 48:11,23 50:6  50:10 63:15 65:3,4  65:11 91:10  <b>type</b> 14:12</p>	<p><b>understanding</b>  21:17 30:9,24 31:7  32:14 88:15  <b>undue</b> 57:23  <b>united</b> 1:1 27:16  <b>universe</b> 15:1 37:14  <b>universitas</b> 57:23  <b>unnecessary</b> 33:21  <b>unredacted</b> 61:20  67:2  <b>unsatisfactory</b>  54:21  <b>untimely</b> 56:13  <b>upheld</b> 59:19  <b>urgency</b> 32:21  <b>use</b> 14:2 17:11 23:5  27:12 43:14 49:8  70:7 79:19,22 80:17  90:8 92:11  <b>uses</b> 12:21  <b>usually</b> 57:17</p>
<b>v</b>			
<p><b>v</b> 1:7,16 2:7  <b>valid</b> 24:3  <b>valley</b> 5:2 6:19  10:21,25 25:7,10,14  61:1,17 70:24 71:8  <b>value</b> 32:8 45:21  <b>various</b> 55:24 87:4  <b>veritext</b> 95:20  <b>versus</b> 57:19,23  59:4,16 62:1  <b>vexing</b> 45:15  <b>viability</b> 22:14  <b>violate</b> 28:4 54:8  <b>violated</b> 8:6 52:24  53:15,15 54:2  <b>violating</b> 53:20  <b>violation</b> 8:4  <b>violations</b> 49:22  81:7  <b>void</b> 43:7</p>			
<b>w</b>			
<p><b>wait</b> 20:17 43:4,18  <b>waited</b> 19:17</p>			

[waived - zeichner]

Page 18

<b>waived</b> 14:18	<b>wit</b> 53:16	<b>worth</b> 63:5 83:9
<b>walk</b> 42:4	<b>withdraw</b> 3:13 6:11	<b>write</b> 82:18
<b>want</b> 13:1 14:19,20	22:23 24:14 39:24	<b>writing</b> 32:7 51:1
24:7 28:9 32:16	55:19 66:5 68:12,14	<b>written</b> 26:6
35:12 38:6 66:16	69:14	<b>wrong</b> 21:20 24:15
67:22 68:17 76:13	<b>withdrawal</b> 11:8,9	41:2,19 90:22
78:16 79:16,21 81:6	11:20,23 13:21	<b>wrongful</b> 7:20
81:18 89:6,8	15:10 73:17 74:17	<b>wrote</b> 51:25 54:24
<b>wanted</b> 46:2 82:12	77:14 80:11,23	<b>x</b>
83:15	81:24 82:18 86:7	<b>x</b> 1:4,10,12,19 2:1,3
<b>wants</b> 41:2 55:20	90:22 91:4 92:9	2:10 94:1
73:4	<b>withdrawals</b> 11:5	<b>y</b>
<b>waste</b> 22:11 29:16	12:13 13:18 35:18	<b>yeah</b> 6:7 11:7 35:24
30:15 67:15	35:22 36:20 37:7,18	40:15 46:5 67:23
<b>way</b> 13:17 14:8,24	38:11 50:10 58:11	73:9 79:4,7 83:10
22:4 32:15 38:5	58:25 61:20 64:22	84:7,25 86:22
45:24 46:13 74:13	82:17,23 83:6 85:3	<b>year</b> 35:19 50:10
77:11 91:10,18	85:11 91:16,18	65:3,11
<b>ways</b> 15:11	<b>withdrawing</b> 23:19	<b>years</b> 36:8,9,13
<b>we've</b> 22:19 28:6,17	23:20 29:2,15 67:8	45:15,19,19,19 50:6
28:18 29:6 41:2,19	69:18	50:11 71:24,25 85:9
41:21 46:13 67:14	<b>withdrawn</b> 12:6	85:12
67:21 73:19 84:23	36:13 39:18 41:16	<b>yesterday</b> 68:11
87:5,25 91:9	58:16 91:1	<b>york</b> 1:2 2:14 4:7,17
<b>week</b> 44:19 56:24	<b>withdraws</b> 41:15	5:4,11
57:1	55:20	<b>young</b> 41:13
<b>weeks</b> 43:2	<b>witness</b> 57:18 83:18	<b>z</b>
<b>weigh</b> 83:13	<b>witnesses</b> 84:20	<b>zabel</b> 5:8
<b>weight</b> 83:14,22	<b>woman</b> 41:13	<b>zeichner</b> 5:1
<b>westlaw</b> 57:24 59:8	<b>wondering</b> 21:5	
61:24	<b>word</b> 46:18	
<b>whatsoever</b> 39:14	<b>words</b> 27:4,6 33:1	
40:23 75:10	66:4 82:9 83:5 91:3	
<b>whim</b> 24:13	92:12	
<b>why'd</b> 75:20	<b>work</b> 43:25 68:23	
<b>wide</b> 92:19	68:25 71:16 87:7	
<b>wife</b> 43:24 44:2	89:20	
61:2	<b>worked</b> 22:19 31:11	
<b>wife's</b> 61:1,3	31:14 32:5 33:13,15	
<b>wilentz</b> 7:11 14:5,6	33:22,24 34:5,10,23	
20:14,15,15,15,17	67:13,21 69:7 74:5	
20:18 28:17 53:24	<b>working</b> 47:25	
55:14 64:25 65:22	84:16	
69:5 70:6	<b>workings</b> 84:4	
<b>wiley</b> 61:25	<b>world</b> 44:10 45:20	
<b>willing</b> 37:7 62:6	60:20	